



INCOHERENCE OF SHIA CREED

By

Sheikhul Islam Ahmad Bin Taymiyyah

Translated and Annotated By

NASIRU GARBA

MINHAJ AS-SUNNAH AN-NABAWIYYAH



INCOHERENCE OF SHIA CREED

BY
SHEIKHUL ISLAM AHMAD BIN
TAYMIYYAH

ABRIDGED BY
SHEIKH ABDULLAH AL-GHUNAIMAN

TRANSLATED AND ANNOTATED BY
NASIRU GARBA

THE PATH OF SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET



In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

Allah says: "And they will say: "Had we but listened or used our intelligence, we would not have been among the dwellers of the blazing Fire!" (67:10)

Contents

INTRODUCTION BY SHEIKH GHUNAIMAN

FORWARD BY THE ENGLISH TRANSLATOR

INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR (IBN TAYMIYYAH)

SEGMENT: SCHOLARS SHALL ELUCIDATE AND BROADCAST THE TRUTH

SEGMENT: THE SIMILITUDE OF RAFIDAH, JEWS AND CHRISTIAN IN MANY ASPECTS

SEGMENT: THE BEGINNING OF CALLING SHIA RAFIDAH AND ZAIDIYYAH

SEGMENT: SOME IRRATIONALITIES OF SHIA RAFIDAH

SEGMENT: VERDICT OF MUSLIMS SCHOLARS ON SHI RAFIDAH

CHAPTER ONE: ON SHIA RAFIDAH'S CLAIM THAT IMAMAH IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE OF RELIGION

SEGMENT: ACTS OF POLYTHEISM BY SOME ASCETICS EVEN IN ALLAH'S LORDSHIP

SEGMENT: ELIAS AND KHIDR DO NOT EXIST

SEGMENT: PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION ACCORDING TO SHIA IMAMIYYAH RAFIDAH

SEGMENT: SHIA RAFIDAH'S CONTRADICTIONS IN WORDS AND APPLICATIONS

SEGMENT: JUST KNOWING AN IMAM WILL NOT PROVIDE ANY BENEFIT TO ANYONE IF HE DIDN'T WORK RIGHTEOUSNESS

SEGMENT: IMAMAH IS NOT ONE OF THE RELIGIOUS OBLIGATIONS

SEGMENT: SHIA RAFIDAH ON LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY AFTER THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH – SUCCESSORSHIP (IMAMAH)

SEGMENT: GROUPS AMONG AHLUS SUNNAH AND OTHER SECTS ON IMAMAH AND CALIPHATE

SEGMENT: METHOD OF ESTABLISHING IMAMAH

CHAPTER TWO: ON THE SHOOL OF THOUGHT THAT MUST BE FOLLOWED

SEGMENT: ON INFALLIBILITY OF PROPHETS AND IMAMS

SEGMENT: LEADERS (IMAMS) ARE NOT CONFINED TO ANY NUMBER

SEGMENT: CORRECT VOW OF ALLEGIANCE

SEGMENT: ON QIYAS (DEDUCTIVE ANALOGY)

SEGMENT: ON SHIA IMAMIYYAH CLAIM THAT FOLLOWING THEIR CREED IS OBLIGATORY

SEGMENT: ON THE EXPLANATION THAT SHIA IMAMIYYAH HAVE CERTITUDE OF SUCCESS FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR IMAMS IS A MIRAGE

SEGMENT: ON SHIA RAFIDAH CLAIM THAT THEY TOOK THEIR CREED FROM THE INFALLIBLES

SEGMENT: DISCUSSIONS ON ALI ZAINUL ABIDEEN, BAQIR AND AS-SADIQ

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON MUSA BIN JA'AFAR AL-KHAZIM

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON ALI BIN MUSA RIDA

SEGMENT: STATEMENT CONCERNING MUHAMMAD BIN ALI AL-JAWWAD

SEGMENT: STATEMENT CONCERNING ALI BIN MUSA AL-HADI

SEGMENT: STATEMENT CONCERNING MUHAMMAD BIN HASSAN THE AWAITED

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE ATTESTATION OF THE RAFIDI WITH HADITH OF MAHDI

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE POSITION OF IMAMS IN OBEDIENCE AND DISOBEDIENCE

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ACCUSED AHLUS SUNNAH OF BEING RAWAFID IN SECRET

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT AHLUS SUNNAH SCHOLARS ARE SHIA ADHERENTS IN THEIR HEARTS

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ACCUSED AHLUS SUNNAH OF PARTISANSHIP WITHOUT RIGHT

SEGMENT: ON MENTIONING THE RIGHT GUIDED CALIPHS DURING SERMON

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON WIPING LEGS IN RITUAL ABLUTION

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE TWO MUT'AHs

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE ACCUSATION THAT ABUBAKAR REFUSED TO GIVE FATIMA HER INHERITANCE

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON FATIMA'S REQUEST FOR FADAK AND RELATED ISSUES

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON SIDDIQ (TESTIFIER TO THE TRUTH) AND WHY HE WAS GIVEN THE TITLE

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON CALLING ABUBAKAR SUCCESSOR OF THE PROPHET

SEGMENT: ON NAMING UMAR AS FARUQ (ONE WHO DISTINGUISH THE TRUTH FROM FASLHOOD)

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE VIRTUES OF AISHA

SEGMENT: REFUTING THEIR ALLEGATIONS AGAINST AISHA, THE MOTHER OF BELIEVERS

SEGMENT: THEY NAMED ONLY AISHA AS MOTHER OF BELIEVERS AND THEY NAMED ONLY MU'AWIYYAH AS MARTENAL UNCLE OF BELIEVERS

SEGMENT: ON DEFENDING MU'AWIYYAH FROM DEFAMATIONS OF RAFIDA AND THEIR COLUMNNY

SEGMENT: DEFENDING MU'AWIYYAH FROM SHIA RAFIDA FALSE ALLEGATIONS

SEGMENT: STATEMENTS OF SHIA RAFIDA ARE SELF NEGATION

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ABOUT KHALID BIN WALID, THE SWORD OF ALLAH

SEGMENT: RAFIDA SUPPORT APOSTATES AGAINST ISLAM AND MUSLIMS

SEGMENT: DISPROVING AND NEGATING SHIA VIEW THAT MU'AWIYYAH IS WORST THAN SATAN

SEGMENT: ON THE LEADERSHIP OF YAZID AND THE MYRTYRDOM OF HUSAIN

SEGMENT: SHIA CENSURES ON THOSE WHO ARE NOT CURSING YAZID

SEGMENT: ON THAT THE CREED OF SHIA RAFIDA IS THE CONFLUENCE OF MISGUDANCE

SEGMENT: PROOFS TO PROVE THE DIVINE APPOINTMENT OF ALI AS THE LEADER (IMAM)

SEGMENT: HADITH OF THE GARMENT DOES NOT PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: ON THE VERSE OF GIVING CHARITY BEFORE CONSULTING THE PROPHET IN PRIVATE

SEGMENT: THE VERSE OF PROVIDING WATER FOR THE PILGRIMES DOES NOT PROVE IMAMAH OF ALI

SEGMENT: ON THAT THE HADITH OF THE LEGATEE IS FABRICATED LIE

SEGMENT: MENTIONING THE EPISODE IN WHICH THE PROPHET CARRIED ALI ON HIS SHOULDERS

SEGMENT: THE HADITH OF THREE TRUTHFUL MEN DO NOT EVINCE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: WORDS OF THE PROPHET TO ALI 'I AM FROM YOU AND YOU ARE FROM ME DOES NOT EVINCE LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: ARGUMENTS OF RAFIDI WITH HADITH OF 'AMR BIN MAIMOUN AND ITS EXPLANATION

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED MOSTLY FABRICATED VIRTUES OF ALI

SEGMENT: RESPONDING TO THE FABRICATED HADITH OF THE DAY OF CONSULTATION

SEGMENT: THE HADITH OF ASCENTION IS FALSE AND A FABRICATED LIE

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE FALLACY OF THE HADITH OF SHIA: 'I AM THE YOUTH'

SEGMENT: CONCERNING THE WORDS ASCRIBED TO ABU DHAR ON LOVING ALI

SEGMENT: ON THE FABRICATED HADITH: LOVE OF ALI IS A GOODNESS THAT IS NOT IMPAIRED BY EVIL

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING SOME FABRICATED HADITHS ON THE VIRTUES OF ALI

SEGMENT: RESPONDING TO SHIA RAFIDA CENSURES AGAINST THE COMPANIONS

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED THE HUMILITY OF ABUBAKAR AS-SIDDIQ

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DESCRIBED VOW OF ALLEGIANCE TO ABUBAKAR AS A MISTAKE

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI SAID ABUBAKAR WAS SORRY FOR THE ANSAR BEFORE HIS DEATH

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ATTACKED ABUBAKAR FOR HIS FEAR OF ALLAH

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR FEAR'S LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED ABUBAKAR FOR NOT GOING OUT FOR CAMPAIGN UNDER USAMA

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT THE PROPHET NEVER APPOINT ABUBAKAR TO ANY POSITION OF AUTHORITY

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR CUT THE LEFT HAND OF A THIEF

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED ABUBAKAR FOR BURNING MUSLIMS

SEGMENT: CLAIMS OF RAFIDI THAT ABUBAKAR IS IGNORANT OF THE LAWS

SEGMENT: ON RAFIDA'S PREFERENCE OF ALI OVER ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE FALSE HADITH OF RAFIDI ON THE VIRTUES OF ALI

SEGMENT: THE RAFID CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR AND UMAR WERE OVERWHELMED BY ALI'S KNOWLEDGE

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ACCUSED ABUBAKAR FOR NOT PUNISHING KHALID BIN WALID

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITISIZED ABUBAKAR ON INHERITANCE OF FATIMA AND BEING NAMED AS CALIPH

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR OVER WHAT HE SAID WHEN HE WAS ABOUT TO DIE

SEGMENT: STATEMET ON THE DOCUMENT THE PROPHET WANT TO WRITE WHILE HE WAS TERMINALLY ILL

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI SLANDERED UMAR ON FATIMA AND ACCUSED HIM OF IMPEDING SHARI'AH

SEGMENT: ON THE SHIA RAFIDI'S CRITSISM OF UMAR FOR CHANGING THE LAW OF EXILE

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT UMAR HAS LITTLE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAWS

SEGMENT: ON THE SHIA RAFIDI'S CLAIM THAT UMAR IS IGNORANT

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR FOR RECONSIDERING HIS OPINION ON DOWRY

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI SLANDERED UMAR: HE HAS NO KWONLEDGE OF LEGAL PUNSHMENT ON WINE

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR FOR A WOMAN WHO MISCARRIED OUT OF FEAR

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ASCRIBED STORY OF THE TWO WOMEN FASLY TO UMAR

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED STORY OF THE WOMAN TO BE EXECUTED

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR ON SHARING STATE WEALTH

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DISPARAGED UMAR FOR EMPLOYING OPINION

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DISPARAGED UMAR ON THE ISSUE OF CONSULTATION TO CHOOSE THE NEXT CALIPH

SEGMENT: STATEMENTS ON THE RAFIDI'S DISPARAGEMENTS AGAINST UTHMAN

SEGMENT: CONTINUED RESPONSES TO THE RAFIDI'S DISPARAGEMENT OF UTHMAN

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI PRESENT THE OPINIONS OF SHAHRASTANI ON DISAGREEMENTS AFTER THE PROPHET

SEGMENT: CONDUCT OF RAFIDA AMONG MUSLIMS IS AIDING UNBELIEVERS AGAINST THEM AND ISLAM

SEGMENT: CONDUCT OF RAFIDA AMONG MUSLIMS AND THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE ON DEALING WITH SECTS AND DISSENTS BASED ON IJTIHAD

SEGMENT: GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON WHAT THE PROPHET'S COMPANIONS ARE ACCUSED OR DISPARAGED

CHAPTER THREE: PROOFS OF SHIA RAFIDA ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING INFALLIBILITY OF ALI AS PROOF TO HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: CRITIQUE OF SHIA TEXTUAL ARGUMENTS ON ALI'S LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: CRITIQUE OF SHIA RAFIDI CLAIM THAT LEADERSHIP OF ALI IS TO PROTECT THE ISLAMIC LAW

SEGMENT: NEGATING RAFIDA'S CLAIM ON THE OBLIGATION OF APPOINTING AN INFALLIBLE IMAM

SEGMENT: NEGATING SHIA ARGUMENT THAT ALI IS THE IMAM BECAUSE HE IS THE BEST

SEGMENT: NEGATING ARGUMENT OF THE RAFIDI WITH THE VERSE OF WILAYAH ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF TABLIG (DECLARATION) IS ON LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING RAFIDI'S CLAIM THAT THE VERSE OF PERFECTION OF RELIGION IS ON LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING ARGUMENT OF THE RAFIDI WITH THE VERSE OF THE STAR ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING ARGUMENTS OF THE RAFID WITH THE VERSE OF CLEANSING ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT LEADERSHIP OF ALI IS PROVED BY THE VERSE ON HOUSE OF ALLAH

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF LOVING FOR KINSHIP IS ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF SACRIFICING THE SELF FOR ALLAH PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSES OF MUTUAL IMPRECATION PROVE THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATION OF THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ADAM RECEIVING WORDS FROM HIS LORD PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF LEADERSHIP PROVES SUCCESSORSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BESTOWING LOVE PROVES THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THE WARNER PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF QUESTIONING PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF TONE OF SPEECH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF FOREMOST PROVES THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE THOSE WHO BELIEVE AND IMMIGRATED PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF PRIVATE CONSULTATION PROVES THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF QUESTIONING PAST PROPHETS PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF KEEN EAR PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT SURATUL IHSAN OF THE QUR'AN PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THE ONE WHO BROUGHT THE TRUTH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF SUPPORT WITH HELP PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ALLAH SUFFICES YOU AND THOSE WHO FOLLOW YOU AMONG THE BELIEVERS PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE ALLAH WILL LOVE THEM AND THEY WILL LOVE HIM PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE THOSE ARE THE SINCERE PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THOSE WHO SPENT THEIR WEALTH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI IS LEADER OF THOSE CALLED BELIEVERS IN THE QUR'AN

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ASKING FOR BELESSING PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING BATINITE EXEGESIS OF THE QUR'AN ON THE VERSE OF TWO SEAS AS ADVANCED BY THE RAFIDI ABOUT ALI AND OTHERS

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THOSE WHO HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCRIPTURE PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE ON THE DAY IN WHICH ALLAH WILL NOT DISGRACE THE PROPHET PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BEST OF CREATURES PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF MAKING KINDRED AND INLAWS PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE BE WITH THOSE WHO ARE TRUE PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BOWING DOWN TO ALLAH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF APPOINTING A HELPER PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BROTHERS FACING EACH OTHER IN PARADISE PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF TESTIFYING PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ALLAH IS HIS PROTECTOR PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF DECLARING THE MESSAGE OF ALLH PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE FALSITY OF THE ARGUMENTS OF THE RAFIDI WITH THE HADITH OF GHADIR KHUM

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH YOU ARE UNTO ME AS AARON IS TO MOSES PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI ON HIS CLAIM THAT ALI CONTINUED TO RULE MADINA UP TO THE DEATH OF THE PROPHET

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING HADITH OF LEGATEE AND SUCCESSORSHIP

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF BROTHERHOOD PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF KHAIBAR PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF BIRD PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF CALLING ALI COMMANDER OF BELIEVERS PROVE HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF THE TWO WEIGHTY THINGS AND ARK OF NOAH PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT FABRICATED HADITH ON LOVE OF ALI PROVE HIS LEADERSHI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING ARGUMENT OF THE RAFIDI THAT WHOEVER DIFFERRED WITH ALI HAS APOSTATE FROM ISLAM

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING DISBELIEF ON THOSE WHO OPPOSED THE CALIPHATE OF ALI

SEGMENT: MENTIONING THE STATUS OF RFIDAH WITH REGARD TO HADITHS AND THAT THEY HAVE NO SOUND PROOF FROM IT IN

SUPPORT OF THEIR CREED

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING ARGUMENTS OF THE RAFIDI WITH
ASCETICISM OF ALI AS PROOF TO HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI HAS
DIVORCED THE WORLD THRICE

SEGMENT: ASCETICISM DOES NOT PROVE THAT A PERSON
DESERVED LEADERSHIP IN CONTRAST TO THE CLAIMS OF THE
RAFIDI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ACTS OF
WORSHIP OF ALI PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: CRITIQUE OF THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI IS THE
MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE COMPANION

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF
KEEN EAR WAS REVEALED CONCERNING ALI

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED THE INTELLIGENCE OF ALI AND
HIS REMAINING WITH THE PROPHET AT ALL TIMES

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED A MAXIM THINKING THAT IT IS A
HADITH

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI STATED THAT ALI CREATED ARABIC
GRAMMAR

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT JURISTS REFER TO ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT BRAVERY OF ALI
PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: FALSIFYING CLAIMS OF THE RAFIDI ON FEATS OF ALI ON
THE DAY OF BADR

SEGMENT: FALSITY AND IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI ON THE EVENTS
OF THE BATTLE OF UHUD

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE LIES AND IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI
CONCERNING BATTLE OF THE COFEDERATES

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MADE FALSE CLAIMS ON THE BATTLE OF
BANU NADHIR

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING WHAT
HE CALL THE BATTLE OF SILSILAH

SEGMENT: LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE BATTLE OF BANU
MUSTALIQ

SEGMENT: LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE STORIES OF
CONQUEST OF KHAIBAR AND MAKKA

SEGMENT: LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE BATTLE OF HUNAIN

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI HAS KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNSEEN WHICH PROVE HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE PRAYERS OF ALI ARE ACCEPTED BY ALLAH AND THIS PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ADVANCED ANOTHER MIRACLE OF ALI AS PROOF TO HIS LEADERSHIP

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ALI FOUGHT WITH JINNS AND SLAYED THEM

SEGMENT: RETURN OF THE SUN FOR ALI

SEGMENT: THE MYTH OF KUFAN FLOOD

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI NARRATED THE MYTH OF ALI WITH A SNAKE

CHAPTER FOUR: ON LEADERSHIP OF THE TWELVE IMAMS

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI ON THE LEADERSHIP OF THE TWELVE IMAMS

SEGMENT: ON THE HADITH OF MAHDI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI ON THE NECESSITY OF THE EXISTENCE OF INFALLIBLE IMAM AT ALL PERIODS

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT VIRTUES OF THE TWELVE IMAMS PROVE THEIR LEADERSHIP

CHAPTER FIVE: ON THE LEADERSHIP OF THE FIRST THREE CALIPHS

SEGMENT: CRITICISMS OF THE RAFIDI ON LEADERSHIP OF THE FIRST THREE CALIPHS

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED ABUBAKAR CLAIMING THAT HE POSSESSED A SATAN

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED THE ALLEGIANCE GIVEN TO ABUBAKAR AS AN OVERSIGHT

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED KNOWLEDGE OF THE CALIPHS

SEGMENT: AN OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICISMS OF THE CALIPHS BY THE RAFIDI

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DISPARAGED THE CALIPHS FOR WORSHIPPING IDOLS BEFORE ISLAM.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CENSURED ABUBAKAR BECAUSE HE HAS REQUESTED TO BE RELIEVED FROM THE CALIPHATE

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ABUBAKAR REGRETTED CONCERNING THE STATUS OF THE ANSAR BEFORE HIS DEATH

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR HARMED ALI AND ZUBAIR AND RAIDED THE HOUSE OF FATIMA

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE CALIPHS ARE PART OF THE ARMY OF USAMA

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE PROPHET NEVER GIVES ABUBAKAR AN APPOINTMENT

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI HAS LIED WHEN HE CLAIMED THAT THE PROPHET HAS REMOVED ABUBAKAR FROM LEADERSHIP OF THE PILGRIMS

SEGMENT: REPLY TO THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT UMAR MADE MISTAKES IN DELIVERING JUDGMENTS

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICISED UMAR ON MAKING TARAWIH PRAYER CONGREGATIONAL

SEGMENT: REPLY TO THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT MUSLIMS AGREED UPON SLAYING UTHMAN

CHAPTER SIX: SHIA RAFIDAH CRITIQUE OF THE CALIPHATE OF ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: REPLY TO THE RAFIDI ON NEGATING THE CALIPHATE OF ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: REPLYING THE RAFIDI ON CRITICIZING CONSENSUS ON THE CALIPHATE OF ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: RESPONDING TO THE RAFIDI ON HIS CRITIQUE OF CONSENSUS

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED PROVING WITH CONSENSUS

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI FAULTED CONSENSUS ON ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI FAULTED THE HADITH ON FOLLOWING THE FOOTSTEPS OF ABUBAKAR AND UMAR

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ATTACK AND DISPARAGE ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE VIRTUES AND EXCELLENCE OF ABUBAKAR IN THE CAVE

SEGMENT: DEFENCE OF ABUBAKAR AND HIS EXCELLENCE IN THE EPISODE OF THE CAVE

SEGMENT: CONTINUED DEFENSE OF ABUBAKAR ON THE EPISODE OF THE CAVE

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITY OF THE RAFIDI THAT
ABUBAKAR IS NOT THE MOST PIOUS

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITY OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING
THE VERSE OF THOSE WHO LAGGED BEHIND

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITIES OF THE RAFIDI ON THE
VIRTUES OF ABUBAKAR ON THE DAY OF BADR

SEGMENT: REMOVING THE AMBIGUITIES OF THE RAFID ON THE
SPENDINGS OF THE ABUBAKAR ON THE PROPHET

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITY OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING
FORWARDING ABUBAKAR TO LEAD PRAYER

EPILOGUE: THE NEED TO PROTECT ONESELF, FAMILY, AND SOCIETY
FROM DEVIANT SECTS

INTRODUCTION BY SHEIKH GHUNAIMAN^[1]

Praise to Allah who brought out the truth and cut up falsehood and its adherents. Allah the Exalted said: **“Nay, We fling (send down) the truth (this Quran) against the falsehood (disbelief), so it destroys it, and behold, it (falsehood) is vanished. And woe to you for that (lie) which you ascribe (to Us) (against Allah by uttering that Allah has a wife and a son)” (21:18).** And: **“Say (O Muhammad): ‘The truth (the Quran and Allah's Inspiration) has come, and falsehood can neither create anything nor resurrect (anything)’” (34:49).** I praise Him with much blessed praises and I bear witness that there is no one who is worthy of being worshipped but Him and I bear witness that Muhammad (s.a.w) is His slave and Messenger; He sent him with guidance and the religion of truth in order to manifest it over all religions and creeds even though the polytheists detest it.

After that: The book “The Path of Sunnah of the Prophet in Appraising the Claims of Rafida and Qadariyah (see footnote no 7),” is one of the greatest books of the Imam, a fighter in the cause of Allah, the patient and the perseverant, the Sheikh of Islam Ahmad bin Abdulhalim bin Abdussalam bin Taimiyyah in which he argued with truth, exposed and vanquished falsehood. Muslims youths of today necessarily need to read this book and understand its content because the creed of Shia Rafida has extended its tentacles in all Muslims countries and other communities, where it has opened its deadly teeth and throw out its snares in front of those who do not know its reality, thereby opening clearly the path of all beguiling hypocrites. Thus, they are able to mislead those who do not know the reality of Shia creed and those who did not read this type of book.

Most of the sects of innovators and vain desires use to subside and decrease in their misguidance and falsehood (sometimes even vanish and became extinct) except Shia Rafida for it increase every day in its extremism, zealotry and determination in fighting the friends of Allah and those who aid His religion. The books of Rafida

are full with curses and abuses to the best of Allah's creation after His Messengers, I mean, the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); and they do not hide their ascription of the Prophet's companions to unbelief and especially the grand among them such as Abubakar as-Siddiq, Umar bin Khattab, Uthman bin Affan and their brothers (r.a) who have extinguished the fire of Zoroastrianism (fire worship) and destroyed their shrines. Their ascribing the Prophet's companions and those who love them to unbelief are written in their reliable books and cannot be exhausted through quotations and citations; they believed that they are worshipping Allah by cursing them and that Shia and their Imams are the only people and all other are scums from Hell Fire to Hell fire; and Allah will not accept any good act from any Muslim no matter how excellent his works are if he do not belong to Shia Rafida (as is stated in one of their books al-Wafi chapter one hundred and seventy nine). In one of their reliable books al-Kafi they clearly indicated their hatred of Islam, he who brought it, those who conveyed it and those who believed in it; they are stating that the Qur'an was revealed concerning two things only: the first thing is on praising Imam Ali bin Abi Talib, and showing his great virtues; he and his progeny. The second thing is on cursing, censuring and mentioning the defects of the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). And for these reasons they believed that two third or three over four of the Qur'an has been lost. They rely in their religion on lies that they ascribe to Imams of the Prophet's family and other false claims and by this they became the greatest liars among all people and a people more prone to believe in lies and falsehood and despite all these they ascribed the Prophet's companions to hypocrisy. We pray to Allah to increase their anger and to destroy them with their fury and same thing to whoever is angered by Islam.

Since the book "The Path of the Sunnah of the Prophet (s.a.w)" contained extensive studies and long expositions and short ones in reply to Qadriyyah, scholastic theologians, and from other sects I chooses to extract only what is related to refuting Shia Rafidah on the issues of the Caliphate (Imamah or successorship to the

Messenger of Allah), the Prophet's companions, Mothers of the believers (wives of the Messenger of Allah) and other issues. I did not add anything to it from myself, neither in its text nor as a commentary, this is because the words of Imam Ibn Taimiyyah has enough strength, simplicity and precision and thus, do not require commentary; it also contained sufficient light of the truth, clarity of exposition and strength of proof which make it self sufficient. May Allah reward him for his struggle in His cause and defense of Islam and its adherent with the best of rewards. We also supplicate to Allah to associate us with him in his efforts and rewards for He is the best of those who are asked and the Most Honorable of those depended on. May Allah bestow His Mercy and Blessings on our Prophet and on his family, his wives and his companions!

SHEIKH ABDULLAH GHUNAIMAN

Professor in the Department of Higher Studies the Islamic
University of Madina,

Saudi Arabia

FORWARD BY THE ENGLISH TRANSLATOR

“It is important that each sane, responsible person put aside partisanship, righted his intension and use the reasoning upon which Allah has created people and not to relegate it to what he was indoctrinated by members of his sect.” IBN AL-WAZIR

Glory be unto Allah who guides whomsoever He will by His Mercy and cause to go astray whomsoever He will by His wisdom. May the blessing of Allah and peace be upon the one who was saddled with delivering the Devine Message through wisdom and beautiful preaching and on all the pure chosen of his companions and members of his household.

Guidance is from Allah and a gift from Him, none possesses the ability to bestow it; not even the Angels and Prophets (a.s). Allah the Exalted the Sublime said: **“Verily, you (Muhammad) guide not whom you like, but Allah guides whom He wills. And He knows best those who are the guided” (28:56).**

Before the reader is a priceless book written by Sheikhul Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in defense of Islam, Muslims and the Prophet’s companions (r.a). The author wrote the original book in four big volumes under the title, Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyyah fi Naqd Kalam ahlul-Rafd and ‘Itizal (The fair path of the Prophet on refuting Shia Rafidah and Mu’atazrites), which was printed under the title, Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyyah fi Naqd Kalam ash-Shia wal-Qadriyyah (The path of Sunnah of the Prophet on refuting Shia and Qadriyyah). This book was abridged recently by Sheikh Abdullah Ghunaiman, a Professor in the Islamic University, Madina, Saudi Arabia, under the title, Mukhtasar Minhaj as-Sunnah (An abridged path of the Sunnah). Before him the book was abridged by the student of Ibn Taimiyyah, Imam Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Uthman al-Dhabi, under the title, Al-Muntaqa min Mihaj al-‘Itidal fi Naqd Kalam Ahlul Rafd wal ‘Itizal (An abridged path of the Sunnah). I have the honor of translating the abridged version of the book by Sheikh Abdullah Ghunaiman and while doing so I made some

additions that I think will make points presented by Ibn Taimiyyah clearer and or richer by extracting them from the abridged version of ad-Dhabi. I have differentiated those additions with stars (***). I also added some footnotes for the same purpose and added the sign ET (English Translator) at the end of them. The abridger also added some footnotes upon which I added the sign AB (Abridger) at the end of them.

SCHOLARS ON EVIL DEVISES OF THE ENEMIES AGAINST ISLAM AND MUSLIMS: Imam Ghazali stated that of those who followed Shia creeds and other forms of deviations are: "... a group of men whose forebears power [dynasty, empire, rule] was cut off by the power [rule] of Islam-like the descendants [scions, sons] of the Khosraws [Persian kings] and the [Persian] grandees and the children of the arrogant Zoroastrians. These are wronged persons [wronged by the killing of a relative during the war of conquest of the Persian Empire by the Muslim armies and they think that they have no way to blood vengeance] in whose hearts rancor is hidden like a secret malady: then, when the suggestions of the liars stimulate it, its fires flare up in their hearts and they submit to the acceptance of every absurdity out of a longing to attain their vengeance and to redress their affairs" (The Infamies of Batinyyah, pg. 19). He further explained (in pgs. 9-11) why deviants and atheists went under ground and under the cover of loving the Prophet's family in order to propagate unbelief thus: "All the transmitters of views agreed that this propaganda was not initiated by anyone belonging to a religion or believing in a creed and supported by a prophetic mission, because its course is being gently pulled from religion as the hair is gently pulled from the dough. Rather a group of the Zoroastrians and the Mazdakites and a gang [party] of the godless dualists and a large band of the godless early philosophers deliberated and actively devoted their individual reasoning to finding [devising, contriving] a measure [plan] which would relieve them from what had befallen them of the domination of men of religion and give them a respite from the distress which had come over them from the power of the Muslims. So they gagged [held] their tongues from speaking of what

their belief was-viz. denying the Maker and branding the Apostle with lying [or calling the Apostle a liar] and rejecting the Assembling and the Resurrection and the return to God at the end of the affair.

They alleged: After we have come to know that all the Prophets are swindlers and cheats, because they enslave men by what they make them believe through different sorts of legerdemain (dexterity, trickery, sophistry) and shrewd analysis -and the matter of Muhammad has become grave and his call has spread in (all countries, quarters) and his rule has become widespread and his means and might are well organized. As a result they [Muslims] have possessed the property of our forebears and abandoned themselves to a life of luxury in their governments [administrative districts], disdaining our minds. Indeed they have covered the face of the earth in its length and its breadth. There is no hope of opposing them by a fight. The only way to make them forego what they have made up their minds about is by cunning and guile. Were we to address to them a call to our doctrine, they would rage against us and be unable to listen to us. So our way is to take over the creed of a group from their sects [a group] who are the feeblest in minds and the most fatuous (vacantly silly, purposeless, idiotic) in individual reasoning and the most pliable in disposition to accept absurdities and the most compliant in believing embellished lies-and these are the Rafidites.

We shall strengthen our position by affiliating with them and by tracing our descent to the people of the [Prophet's] house to avoid their evil [i.e. their being against us], and we shall ingratiate ourselves with them by that which suits their character, viz. the mention of the great injustice and terrible humiliation effected against their forbears. We shall pretend to weep with them over what befell the family of Muhammad (Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) and thereby we shall succeed in denigrating the leaders of their forbears who are their model and pattern. The result will be that, once we have made the circumstances of their [forbears] repulsive in their eyes, and also what their Law transmits to them by the transmission and report of those [forbears] the door of recourse to the Law will be closed [or hard] for them and it will be easy for us to

entice them into being stripped of [forfeiting, losing] religion. If there then remains among them anyone holding fast to the literal meanings of the Qur'an and unimpeachable Traditions, we shall suggest among them that those literal texts contain secrets and inner meanings, and that the mark of the stupid man is being deceived by their literal meanings and the sign of acumen [intelligence] is in believing their inner meanings. Then we shall communicate to them our beliefs, alleging that they are what is meant by the literal meanings of the Qur'an. Then when we have duped these, it will be easy for us to entice the rest of the sects after joining [siding with] these [Rafidites] and pretending that they support us.

Then they said: Our method will be to choose such a man as will help us in our doctrine. We shall claim that he belongs to the People of the House [Muhammad's family], and that all men must swear allegiance to him and are bound to obey him, for he is the Caliph of the Apostle of Allah and preserved from error and slip by help from Allah Most High. [p. 20] Moreover we shall not make this propaganda known near to the vicinity of the Caliph (Imam) whom we have characterized with infallibility, because the proximity of his abode might rip apart these veils. But if the distance be remote and far away, then when will the one who responds to the propaganda be able to investigate his condition and to get to know the reality of his real situation? (can you now see why the Imams of the Prophet's family are living in Madina while most of those who are narrating their hadiths are living in Kufa- Iraq?). *Now their aim in all that was power and domination and making free with the wealth and women of the Muslims, and revenging themselves on them for what they believed about them and for what they had over taken them of pillage and bloodshed and had poured upon them of various kinds of misfortune. This, then, is their ultimate aim and the fundamental principle of their affair.* The confirmation of that will become clear to you through our clear exposure of the evils of their teaching and the infamies of their creed". Imam Ghazali further explained of the methods that Shia employ to mislead Muslims from the right path in a summarized form thus: "As for the summary, it is that it is a

doctrine, the exterior of which is *rafd* [rejection, i.e. of first three Caliphs], and its interior out-and-out infidelity [unbelief]; and its beginning is the restricting of the ways to attain knowledge [sure cognitions] to the utterance of the Infallible Imam, and the removal [isolating] of minds [intellects] from being [able to] perceive [grasp] the truth because of the doubts which befall them and the disagreements to which reasoners are open, and imposing, for the seeking of the truth, the way of instruction and learning, and the judgment that the Infallible Imam is the seer [the only one able to see], and that he is informed-from the part of God-of all the secrets of the revealed Laws: he guides to the truth and explains problems [difficulties], and that every age must have an Infallible Imam to whom recourse is to be had concerning any ambiguities in religious matters.

This is the beginning [basis, starting point] of their propaganda. Then, in the end they present [produce] what contradicts the Law (Sharia). And it is as though this is their ultimate aim. For the manner of their propaganda is not fixed in one way, but rather they address each group with that which accords with its opinion, after they have obtained from them submission to themselves and friendship for their Imam: thus they agree with Jews and Christians and Zoroastrians on the sum of their beliefs and they confirm them in them [their beliefs]. This, then, is the sum of their doctrine.”

Ustaz Muhibbuddeen al-Khatib also, in his introduction to the book ‘Tuhfatul Ithna-Ashariyyah’ (pg. III) by Shah ad-Dahlawi mentioned the reasons why Persians (Zoroasterians) and Jews hate Islam, the Arabs and the Prophet’s companions (r.a) stating: “(The Persians and the Jews) hold hatred and malice deep in their hearts against the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w), who are his beloved, and his aids on the (religion) of truth; because they have quenched (put out) the fire of Zoroasterian (Magian religion) forever and brought Iran into the fold of the Islamic state and they have constructed al-Aqsa Mosque on the ruins of the temple. These are the crimes committed by Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Abu Ubaidah bin Jarrah, Khalid bin Walid, Sa’ad bin Abi Waqqas, ‘Amr bin ‘Aas, Mu’awiya bin Abi

Sufyan, Yazid bin Abi Sufyan and the rest of their brothers, the conquerors, the doers of good, whose grand virtuous acts can never be forgotten by those Magians and Jews and who held ardent, chronic hatred and malice against them. Their forefathers have tried to stop the Islamic conquest and the spread of the Islamic message with their weapons and other stratagem; army facing an army, encounter after encounter and fiercest battle after fierce battle until they were defeated by Allah in all battlefields and they were cut off in all ferocious encounters. Thus they started to wait for an opportunity against the pioneer Muslims by which they can afflict them with some evil as a revenge for their defeats. When the awaited chance did not come by and the period of Umar's caliphate seems to them prolonged, the Islamic state continue to expand and the Islamic religion continue to spread over vast area of the world; they hatched a plan to kill the Commander of Believers Umar bin al-Khattab (r.a)... The Magians that killed Umar (r.a) thought that they have brought an end to Islam by his death, but they found that they have failed for Allah has protected His Message and guided its champions with His aid. During the Caliphate of Uthman the army of Islam continued their conquest beyond Iran... At this moment the Magians and the Jews realized that the sound Islam of Muhammad (s.a.w) cannot be fought face to face in a fair battlefield and that it cannot be destroyed through the murder of its great men or its leaders and they decided to pretend and feign accepting Islam and to mix up with Muslims with the intension of being the fifth columnist from within the borders of Islam; that is when they decided to take cover under the message of Islam and its first pioneers and they chosed the name (and person) of Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a), so that they use him as a shield for their sinister destructive plans against Islam and the first person who chosed him is a Jew (Abdullah bin Saba)..."

Sheikh Khaimees stated: The firm and trustworthy Imam Abu Zurrah Al-razi have said, "If you see a person dishonored any of the prophet's (s.a.w) companions(r.a), know that this person is a non-believer, the reason for this is because we believe that the prophet Mohammed (s.a.w) is a certain truth and because we believe that

the Quran is a certain truth and those ones who passed on and delivered the Sunnah of the prophet Mohammed (s.a.w) and the Noble Quran to us are the prophet's family and his companions(r.a) and the Shia(Rafidah) want to disprove and stab the people who passed down to us the Sunnah and the holy Quran, so they the Shia(Rafidah) are more entitled to be addressed as a non believers.”

We can say that this Imam can see things through one step ahead by Allah’s grace. This Imam understood and fully aware of the main reason on why the Shia (Rafidah) stab and slander the prophet's companions(r.a). We have to be fully aware of and know that the Shia (Rafidah) are not targeting the prophet's companions because of who they are or their person and they the Shia (Rafidah) are not attacking the prophet's companions out of concern and care for the religion of Islam and they are not doing this out of concern for the prophet and his family in accordance to their claims. The main goal and reason behind what they are doing is much greater than what you think! The Shia (Rafidah) want to annihilate the religion of Islam. They want to abolish the holy Quran which is passed on to us by the prophet's companions. And they want to abolish the prophet's Sunnah which is passed on to us by (or through) his companions. Who are the ones who passed on the holy Quran and Prophet's Sunnah to us? The prophet's companions are the ones who passed them to us.

If we examine how the Noble Quran passed down to us, we can conclude that the ones who passed it down are trustworthy people. The companions passed down the Quran from the prophet(s.a.w) by a successive chain of narrations. This is the reason why they are attacking the companions (r.a) for they want to destroy our proofs and make us doubt Islam.

After studying the above submissions one will realize that a number of factors made the Persians and their clients hostile to Islam, Muslims and the Arabs who were the pioneer champions of Islam; one will realize that those who are against Islam and Muslims are people who lost their privileged positions such as the rulers, the clergy, army generals and the nationalists. The nationalist movement

is called Shu'ubiyyah and in this regard Alsulami, Mohammed S.H, stated while quoting from T. Todorov, *The Morals of History*: "Indeed, the sense of being a Persian and an awareness of the existence of inferior others can be seen to have begun at least as early as the Achaemenid period, when the descriptions of Herodotus throw light on how Persians created the Other. He tells us in a well-known passage, for example, how the Persians thought of themselves as the best of mankind, considering others to be of increasingly less worth, the farther away they lived. Herodotus describes the Persians as follows: They honor most of all those who dwell nearest them, next those who are next farthest removed, and so going ever onwards they assign honor by this rule; those who dwell farthest off the hold least honourable of all; for they deem themselves to be in all regards by far the best of all men, the rest to have but a proportionate claim to merit, till those who dwell farthest away have least merit of all" (Alsulami, Mohammed S.H, Iranian Orientalism : notions of the other in modern Iranian thought, pg. 26). Explaining further the concept of Shu'ubiyyah Alsulami quoted the Iranian historian Jalāl al-Dīn Humā'ī who divides it into three different groups: 1) the preference of Arabs to all other nations, 2) equality between all nations (equality party), and 3) preference of 'Ajam (non-Arabs) and humbling the Arab race (Shu'ūbī Party), (J. Humā'ī, *Shu'ūbiyya*, Qudsī, Manuchihr, ed., Isfahān: Sā'ib, 1984, pp. 56-7). What concerned us in this study is that third category of Shu'ubiyyah concerning whom Alsulami stated: "The Shu'ūbiyya movement took different forms during its development; firstly, the literary form involved debates and discussions between Arab and Iranian thinkers attempting to humiliate one another. These debates dealt mostly with matters of kingship, language, customs and culture, parallel with the transmission of literary pieces from pre-Islamic Persian literature. Secondly, the religious form began with a popular translation movement, supported mainly by the clerical class, with the aim of reviving the Iranian culture and legacy. These translations included Manichaean, Mazdakaean and Zoroastrian religious works. This religious tendency within the Islamic empire was called zandaqa, a term that designated the followers of the Mani faith, but was later

used for all groups that had endeavoured to defame Islam and return to the ancient Iranian religions, such as the revolt of Bābak Khurramī in the reign of Caliph al-Mu'tasim. Next, the political form of the Shu'ūbiyya started once Iranians had obtained very high political positions during the Abbasid era, when the caliph was an Arab, while the viziers and other high ranking bureaucratic officials were of Iranian stock. ...According to al-Jāhiz (d. 869), the followers of the Shu'ūbiyya were mainly people who were suspected of being *zindiqs* (heretics), in other words, holders of unorthodox or heretical religious beliefs. He describes them as follows: '[I]t was the Shu'ūbīs who established the idea of questioning Islam and this led them to stray from the true path. If a man hates a certain thing then he hates him who possesses it, or is associated with it. If he hates [the Arabic] language then he hates the [Arabian] peninsula, and if he hates that peninsula then he loves the one who hates it. Thus matters go from bad to worse with him until he forsakes Islam itself, because it is the Arabs who brought it; it is they who provided the venerable forefathers and the example worthy of imitation. This statement clearly illustrates the relationship between the Shu'ūbiyya and *zandaqa*, because both parties were hostile to the Arabs and to Islam and because the bulk of those who were sceptical in regard to Islam were inspired at the outset by the ideas of the Shu'ūbiyya" (Alsulami, Mohammed S.H, Iranian Orientalism: notions of the other in modern Iranian thought, pg. 30-31).

The Shia web site www.hubeali.com posted an e-book titled: Jihad during occultation of Imam (pgs. 18-19) in which they quoted a hadith from al-Kafi vol 5, page 13, which illustrated their hatred of the Arabs was partly due to the conquest of Persian and the Roman Empires as follows: ... The words of Allah; '*Permission to fight is given to them because of injustice done to them and Allah has the power to help them (22:39).*' When this verse, "permission to fight ..." was revealed about Muhajirin (immigrants) who were expelled from Makkah, their homeland and their properties, it became lawful. He made it lawful for them to fight. I (the narrator) then asked: 'This was revealed about Muhajirin because of the injustice of the pagans of

Makkah. On what basis did they fight Kisra' and Qaysar (Persians and Romans) and others such as pagan Arab tribes?" The Imam replied: 'If permission to fight was given only because of the injustice done to them by the pagans of Makkah, they then had no reason to fight such multitudes like Kisra ', Qaysar and people other than the people of Makkah of the Arab tribes. This is because those who did injustice to them (al-Muhajirun) were not these people. Instead, they were the people of Makkah who had expelled them (al-Muhajirun) from their homeland and had dispossessed them of their properties without good reason. If the verse applied only to al-Muhajirun, who were oppressed by the people of Makkah, this verse would remain without any applicable effect to others thereafter al-together; no one of the oppressors and the oppressed would have existed anymore. The obligation mentioned in it would have been lifted entirely after those people; the oppressed and the oppressors would have ceased to exist. In fact, it is not the way you thought it was, as I mentioned earlier. However, al-Muhajirun were oppressed in two ways. People of Makkah oppressed them by expelling them from their homeland and dispossessed them of their properties. Thus, they fought them by the permission of Allah. Kisra' and Qaysar and others besides such people as the Arab and non-Arab tribes who oppressed them by keeping what rightfully belonged to the believing people. They fought them by the permission of Allah in this matter. Based on the authority of this verse: *'Those who are subjected to injustice are given permission to fight and Allah has the power to help them'* (22:39). The believing people of all times have the permission to fight. Allah, however, has given permission to the believing people who stand up to the stipulations which Allah has described and fulfill the requirements they need to have in belief and Jihad (the permission of an Infallible Imam). Whoever then stands up to such stipulations is a believer, an oppressed and has permission to do Jihad in the sense mentioned. Those, otherwise, are oppressors and are not oppressed-ones. They, therefore, do not have the permission to fight, to prohibit from committing evil or command people to do good. It is because they are not qualified for such tasks and do not have the permission to call to Allah..." The above so called hadith of

the Shia is partly condemning the Prophet's companions for conquering the Persian and the Roman Empires and spreading Islam in all parts of the world for according to the Shia distorted belief the Prophet's companions are only permitted by Allah to fight the Makkan people who oppressed them and therefore by fighting other tribes and conquering other land they are the ones who are committing oppression.

Imam Malik was asked concerning the Shia Rafida and he replied: "Do not speak to them or narrate (hadith) from them, for surely they are liars." During one of Imam Malik's classes, it was mentioned that the Rafidi Shia curse the Prophet's companions. Imam Malik recited the verse, **"Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves... So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them" (48:29)**. He then said, "Whoever becomes enraged when the Prophet's companions are mentioned is the one (of the disbelievers) about whom the verse speaks" (Tafsir al-Qurtubi). Imam Shafi'i stated with regard to Shia Rafidah: "I have not seen among the heretics a people more famous for falsehood than the Rafidi Shia." And on another occasion he said: "Narrate (accept) knowledge (hadith and other sciences) from everyone you meet except from the Shia Rafida, because they invent hadiths and adopt them as part of their religion" (Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyyah). It was reported that often Imam Abu Hanifah used to repeat the following statement about Shia Rafidah; "Whoever doubts whether they are disbelievers has himself committed disbelief." Imam Abu Zur'ah ar-Razi said concerning the Shia Rafidah doctrine of cursing the Prophet's companions: "If you see someone degrade any of the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w), know that he is a disbeliever. Because the Prophet (s.a.w) was real, what he brought was the truth and all of it was conveyed to us by way of his companions (r.a). What those disbelievers wish to do is cast doubt on the reliability of our narrators (and sources of religious knowledge) in order to invalidate the Qur'an and Sunnah. Thus the disbelievers (Shia Rafidah) are the ones most deserving of defamation." Imam al-Khilal

said: Abdulmalik ibn Abdulhamid informed me saying: I heard Abu Abdullah [Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal] say: 'Whosoever reviles the Companions (r.a); then I fear disbelief for him like the Rawafid'. Then he said, 'Whosoever reviles the Companions of the Prophet, then we do not believe he is safe from having rejected the Religion'" (Sunnan lil-Khilal, 3:493). Imam Abu Hamid al-Ghazali asked himself questions and gave answers with regard to abusing and or assigning unbelief to the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w): "Question; If one were to believe in the sinfulness of Abubakar, Umar and others of the Companions, but not in their unbelief, would you judge this to be unbelief?" "Answer; No, but we would judge it to be sinfulness, error and opposition to the Consensus of the Community. Allah ordained only eighty stripes [lashes] for one falsely accusing a chaste person of adultery-and this prescription extends to all persons thus accused, even Abubakar and Umar, had they been so accused." "Question; If one were to explicitly declare the unbelief of Abubakar and Umar, should he be assigned the same position as that of one who declares the unbelief of another Muslim person or judge or Imam?" "Answer; So we hold. So, declaring the unbelief of the former differs from declaring the unbelief of other Muslims only in two things: (1) opposition to and contravention of Consensus; (2) Contradicting reports about the former being promised the Garden and praise of them, etc-so, one accusing them of unbelief is himself guilty of unbelief, not because he charges them with unbelief, but because he gives the lie to the Apostle of Allah" (Infamies of Batiniyyah, pg. 68).

Recently, the Shia Rafidah have rose up spreading their creed among the ignorant and people of vain desires. They are spreading their creeds through attacking Islam, Muslim scholars and the Prophet's companion and by distorting the Qur'an, Sunnah and advancing fabricated hadiths to support their claims. They are doing all these in order to destroy Islam and in contravention of the teachings of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and the Imam (scholars) of the Prophet's household. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has said concerning his companions that they are the best Muslims of all

times. It come in sound hadiths: Narrated Abdullah: The Prophet (may peace be upon him) said, ***“The best people are those living in my generation, and then those who will follow them, and then those who will follow the latter. Then there will come some people who will bear witness before taking oaths, and take oaths before bearing witness” (Bukhari).*** And narrated `Imran bin Husain: ***“Allah’s Apostle said, ‘The best of my followers are those living in my generation and then those who will follow the latter” Imran added, “I do not remember whether he mentioned two or three generations after his generation, then the Prophet added, ‘There will come after you, people who will bear witness without being asked to do so, and will be treacherous and untrustworthy, and they will vow and never fulfill their vows, and fatness will appear among them” (Bukhari).*** We find similar hadith from Shia source as follows: From Musa bin Ja’afar from his fathers who said: ***“The Messenger of Allah (saw) said: There will be four generations, the best of generations is the one in which I am living, then the second, then the third” [Biharul Anwar Volume:22 Page:309].***

In Shia sources we find a lot of hadiths from scholars of the Prophet’s household on praises of the Prophet’s companions and their excellence, for instance, Abu Abdullah as-Sadiq said, ***“There were twelve-thousand companions for Allah’s Prophet (s.a.w). Eight Thousands of them were from Medina, two thousands of them were from Mecca and another two thousands of them were the free atheist who had become Muslims. There were no Qadarites, Marji’ites, Kharajites, or Mu’tazilites (among them), nor any who act according to their own opinions (or vain desires). They cried day and night and said, ‘O Allah! Please take away our souls before we eat barley bread” (Khisal by Sheikh Saduq).*** Shia scholar Majlisi has narrated from Tusi who has narrated a Muwathaq tradition, from Ali that he said ***“I order you regarding the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w), do not criticize them, because they are the companions of your Prophet (s.a.w). They are his companions, they did not start any***

bid'ah (innovation) in the religion, nor given honor to any innovator. Yes! The Prophet (s.a.w) has ordered me regarding them" (Hayat ul Qulub , Vol. 2, p. 621).

Mansur ibn Hazim who has said: ***"I said to (Imam) Abu 'Abdullah, 'It is confuses me that when I ask you a question and you give an answer and then other person comes and you give a different answer for the same question.' The Imam replied, 'We answer people in a larger and reduced forms.' I then asked, 'Did the Sahabah, companions of the holy Prophet speak the truth or lies when narrating his Hadith?' The Imam replied, 'They spoke the truth.' I then said, 'Why then they have differences?' Have you not considered the fact that a man would come to the holy Prophet (s.a.w) and ask a question and would give him an answer and then he would answer that would abrogate the previous answer. Thus, hadiths abrogated other hadiths."*** [Kulayni narrated in his "al-Kafi" (1/65), and Majlisi said it's hasan (good)].

Ali (r.a) said: ***"I order to you regarding the Companions (r.a) of Muhammad (SAW), do not criticize them, They were the people after the Prophet (SAW), who did not bring any innovation in the religion and never supported any innovation and the Prophet (SAW) ordered to behave well towards them" (Bihar al-Anwar 22/305).*** Similarly, we read in Shia book of Shiekh Sadooq: Prophet (saw) said ***"The Ummah will be divided into seventy three (73) sects, all of them will go to Hell except one". He was asked "Which sect is that one". Prophet (peace be upon him) said "That is the one on which I and my companions (ashabi) are" (Shia book, Ma'ani Al Akhbar, Page 370).*** Imam Reza has narrated through his forefathers that the Prophet (saw) said: ***"One who kills a prophet should be killed, and one who talks ill about his companions should be flogged" [Bihar al-Anwar, Vol. 76, p. 222].***

The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"Allah, Allah! Fear Him with regard to my Sahabah! Do not make them targets after me! Whoever loves them loves them with his love for me; and whoever hates***

them hates them with his hatred for me. Whoever bears enmity for them, bears enmity for me; and whoever bears enmity for me, bears enmity for Allah. Whoever bears enmity for Allah is about to perish!” (Narrated from Abdallah ibn Mughaffal by Al-Tirmidhi, by Ahmad with three good chains in his Musnad, al-Bukhari in his Tarikh, al-Bayhaqi in Shu`ab al-Iman, and others. Al-Suyuti declared it hasan in his Jami` al-Saghir #1442). In another hadith narrated Abu Sa`id: The Prophet said, “Do not abuse my companions for if any one of you spent gold equal to Uhud (in Allah’s Cause) it would not be equal to a Mud (handful) or even a half Mud (hand full) spent by one of them” (Bukhari, Muslim).

“Our Lord, forgive us and [forgive] our brethren who preceded us in faith. And do not put in our hearts rancor towards the Believers. Our Lord, You are Most Kind, Most Merciful” (59:10).

“ O you who believe! Stand out firmly for Allah and be just witnesses and let not the enmity and hatred of others make you avoid justice. Be just: that is nearer to piety, and fear Allah. Verily, Allah is Well-Acquainted with what you do” (5:8).

“Truth has (now) arrived, and Falsehood perished: for Falsehood is (by its nature) bound to perish” (17:81).

**NASIRU GARBA
THE TRANSLATOR FROM ARABIC**

TO ENGLISH

INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR (IBN TAYMIYYAH)

Sheikhul Islam Taqiy ud - Deen Ahmad ibn Abdul - Halim ibn Abdus - Salam ibn Taymiyyah al - Haraani, ad - Dimashqee stated:

Glory to Allah who: **“...Sent Prophets with glad tidings and warnings and with them He sent the Scripture in truth to judge between people in matters wherein they differed. And only those to whom (the Scripture) was given differed concerning it after clear proofs had come unto them through hatred, one to another. Then Allah by His Leave guided those who believed to the truth of that wherein they differed. And Allah guides whom He wills to a Straight Path” (2:231).**

I bear witness that there is no one worthy of being worshipped but Allah Alone with no partner as He himself has bears witness that none has the right to be worshipped but He, and the angels, and those having knowledge (also give this witness); (He is always) maintaining His creation in Justice. None has the right to be worshipped but He, the All-Mighty, the All-Wise.

I also bear witness that Muhammad (s.a.w) is His slave with whom He sealed His Prophets and Messengers, guides with him His friends and His blessing, as He has stated in the Noble Qur'an: **“Verily, there has come unto you a Messenger (Muhammad) from amongst yourselves (i.e. whom you know well). It grieves him that you should receive any injury or difficulty. He (Muhammad) is anxious over you (to be rightly guided, to repent to Allah, and beg Him to pardon and forgive your sins, in order that you may enter Paradise and be saved from the punishment of the Hell-fire), for the believers (he is) full of pity, kind, and merciful. . But if they turn away, say (O Muhammad): ‘Allah is sufficient for me. None has the right to be worshipped**

but He, in Him I put my trust and He is the Lord of the Mighty Throne.” (9:128-129).

After that: A number of people of the Ahlus Sunnah and Jama'ah (community) brought to me a book that was written by one Rafidah^[2] (Shia) scholars of our time who is displaying his merchandise and inviting people to the creed of Imamiyyah Rafidah; whoever he can be able to invite among rulers, leaders and other ignorant men, whose knowledge of science and religion is limited and who lacks the knowledge of Muslim's principles of religion. He was aided in his cause by those who traditionally aid the Rafidah of the Batinites^[3] atheists, who in their hearts are philosophers, who worship celestial bodies and who are actually outside the fold of those who follows the Messengers of Allah (s.a.w), do not believe in following the religion of Islam and do not forbid following religions other than Islam; nay they believe that creeds are just like political parties which one can identify with at his wish and that Prophethood is a general fair politics that has been laid down for people's common well being in this world.

These types of people are many and they come out in the open (in order to propagate their falsehood) whenever ignorance and its people increased and there is nobody among the people of Prophethood and its followers who can bring out its light with which they obliterate darkness and misguidance and made bare what contradict it of falsehood, polytheism and impracticality. Those people are not denying Prophethood completely, but they believe in some of its manifestations and disbelieve in some of its manifestations and they differ in degrees with regard to what they believe and what they disbelieve. For these reasons ignorant people falls into doubts concerning them because of the great veneration they showed to Prophethood. Rafidah and Jahmiyyah^[4] are the main door to those atheists and from them they entered into a lot of unbelief in the Beautiful Names of Allah (by denying or uttering impious things against His Names and Attributes) and the clear verses of His Book; those ideas are also propagated by the heads of atheism such as Qarmatians^[5] and other hypocrites.

Those who brought the book to me informed me that this is one of their biggest weapon with which they propagate their creed among those who incline to them among rulers and other people. He wrote this book for a known king who he named Khudaband (see footnote number 19) and they asked me to explain what the book contained of falsehood, misguidance and untruth for in doing so the slaves of Allah, the believers are aided and the falsehood of the atheists liars is uncovered. I informed them that although this book is in a higher grade of what they advance as proof and evidence; yet those people are among the most strayed away from the right path. This is because proofs are either textual or intellectual and those people are among the most strayed in advancing textual and intellectual evidences; they are closer in description to those whom Allah says concerning them: **"Had we but listened or used our intelligence, we would not have been among the dwellers of the blazing Fire!" (67:10).**

They are the most liars in textual quotations and the most ignorant in intellectual reasoning, they consider of the hadiths as sound what the scholars knew of necessity to be fabricated falsehood and they disbelieve in sound, successive, concurrent hadiths that come to us generation after generation. They do not differentiate among those who carry knowledge and report hadith between those who are known liars, or mistake makers or the ignorant in what they report and those who are just, good memorizers, accurate in their reporting, who are known as possessors of knowledge and tradition; what they (the Shia) rely on is blind imitation even if they think that they are advancing proofs. Sometimes they follow Mu'atazilites^[6] and Qadriyyah^[7] and at times they follow Mujassamah^[8] and Jabriyyah (the compulsionists – see footnote 4 above). They are the most ignorant of all sects concerning intellectual reasoning and that is why they are considered by all men of religion and knowledge to be the most ignorant sect of all sects that considered themselves as Muslims. Among them are those who introduced into the religion uncountable corruption for the atheists Ismailiyyah^[9] and Nusairiyyah^[10] and other exorcists hypocrites come in through their

door. The enemies of Islam of the polytheists and people of the Book succeeded through them and by their aids they were able to conquer Muslims countries, took Muslims as slaves, plunder their wealth and spilt their innocent blood; a lot of uncountable corruption in religion and worldly benefits befall the Islamic community due to their aiding enemies of Islam over the Muslims.

The root of Shia creed was established through atheists and hypocrites, whom Imam Ali (r.a) punished during his blessed life time; he burnt a group of them with fire, he sought to kill some of them but they fled from his sharp cutting sword and he threatened severe scourging to a group of slanderers as was narrated from him narrations in that regard. It was narrated from him a concurrent hadith that he declared from the pulpit in Kufa: ***“The best of this community after its Prophet is Abubakar and then Umar”*** (Bukhari, Abu Dawud, Ibn Majah etc.). This is what his son Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah replied (to questioners on who is the best of the Islamic community after its Prophet). And for this reason the early Shia who have accompanied Imam Ali (r.a) or those who have lived at that time never differed on preferring Abubakar and Umar (r.a) over Ali (r.a), but they have differed concerning preferring Imam Ali over Uthman (r.a). This is a fact that is being confessed by grand Shia scholars in the past and at the present and Abul Qasim al-Balkhi has mentioned similar statement. He said: “A questioner asked Shuraik bin Abdullah saying; who among them is better Abubakar or Ali? And he replied him saying: ‘Abubakar.’ The questioner said to him: ‘You are making this statement and you are a Shia adherent?’ He replied him saying: ‘Yes, whoever did not say that is not a Shia adherent. I swear by Allah that Imam Ali ascended this pulpit and said: Surely, the best of this community after its Messenger (s.a.w) is Abubakar and then Umar; then how can we reject his words? How can we say that he is a liar? By Allah he is never a liar.” This has been quoted by Abdul Jabbar al-Hamdani in his book titled “Tathbitun Nubuwwah.”^[11] He mentioned that it was stated by Abul Qasim al-Balkhi while refuting al-Jahiz.

SEGMENT: SCHOLARS SHALL ELUCIDATE AND BROADCAST THE TRUTH

When they persist that I shall write a reply to this clear misguidance, mentioning that failure to do so is forsaking and abandonment of the Muslims and the arrogant people will feel that it is a kind of inability to refute falsehood. I thus, wrote what Allah eased for me of explanations as a fulfillment of the vow Allah took from those endowed with knowledge and belief, standing for justice and bearing witness for the sake of Allah, as Allah the Most High has said: **“O you who believe! Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to Allah, even though it be against yourselves, or your parents, or your kin, be he rich or poor, Allah is a Better Protector to both (than you). So follow not the lusts (of your hearts), lest you may avoid justice, and if you distort your witness or refuse to give it, verily, Allah is Ever Well Acquainted with what you do” (4:135).**

Lack of “standing for justice” entailed changing the witness and “forsaking” entailed hiding it. And Allah has commanded truth and explaining it and forbids liars and hiding the truth in whatever people need to know and be acquainted with. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said in an agreed upon hadith: ***“The buyer and the seller have the option of cancelling or confirming the bargain unless they separate, and if they spoke the truth and made clear the defects of the goods, then they would be blessed in their bargain, and if they told lies and hid some facts, their bargain would be deprived of Allah's blessings” (Bukhari and Muslim).*** (Thus, hiding the truth is forbidden) especially hiding the truth when the last of this community curse the first of this community, for in a hadith: ***“If the last of this community curses the first of this community whoever has any knowledge shall broadcast it for hiding knowledge at that time is like hiding what Allah sent down to Muhammad (s.a.w).”*** [\[12\]](#)

This is because the first of this community are the people who established religion through belief, knowledge, action, propagation and conveyance; therefore disapproving them is disapproving

religion, which will entail rejecting what Allah sent with the Prophets. This is the first objective of the one who innovated Shia creed, for his main goal is to hinder men from the path of Allah and falsify what the Messengers brought from Allah. And that is why they bring out their creeds in accordance to the weakness of religion (among people) and the reality of this innovated misguidance is made apparent among the atheists.

(Latter on Shiism) spread among those who are neither atheists nor hypocrites due to some doubt and ignorance that are mixed up with vain desires, and therefore they accepted some misguidance and this is how all falsehood start. Allah says: **“By the star when it goes down, (or vanishes). Your companion (Muhammad) has neither gone astray nor has erred. Nor does he speak of (his own) desire. It is only an Inspiration that is inspired” (53:1-4).** Here Allah exonerated His Messenger from going astray and erring. Going “astray” means lack of knowledge and “erring” means following vain desires. Just like what Allah says: **“... But man bore it. Verily, he was unjust (to himself) and ignorant (of its results)” (33:72).**

Here the “unjust” is the one who goes astray and the “ignorant” is the one who has erred; except those whom Allah has forgiven.

Now, this is the condition of people of innovation, it is based on contradicting the Qur'an and Sunnah for they follow nothing but guess and what they themselves desires and therefore they possess ignorance and injustice and especially the Rafidah for they are greatest possessors of ignorance and injustice among those who follows their own desires. They are holding enmity to the friends of Allah, after their Prophet (s.a.w); the Muhajirun (Prophets companions who immigrated from Makka to Madina), Ansar (Prophet companions living in Madina who aided the Messenger of Allah and those who immigrated to them from Makka), and those who follows them in goodness and are pleased with Him. At the same time you find them befriending unbelievers, polytheists, hypocrites, Jews and Christians and groups of atheists such as Nusairiyyah, Ismailiyyah and other misguided sects. You will find them or most of them if two people debate concerning their Lord among Muslims and

unbelievers and people differ concerning what the Prophets have brought; some of them believe and some of them disbelieve; it does not matter whether the difference is by words or action, like wars that occurs between Muslims, people of the Book and polytheists. You will find them aiding polytheists and people of the Book over the Muslims, the people of Qur'an. People have experienced manifold their aiding of polytheists among the Turks (Mongols and Tartars) and others against the people of Islam in Khorasan (a region in Iran), Syria, Iraq, Arabian Peninsula and other places. They have aided the Christian (Crusaders etc.) over the Muslims in Syria, Egypt and other countries in many occasions. Among the great calamities that befall Muslims in the fourth and the seventh centuries of Islam is when the unbelievers Turks (Mongols and Tartars) attacked Islamic countries and killed a lot of Muslims (whose number of casualties is only known by Allah), they are the greatest people that showed enmity to the Muslims and aided the unbelievers. Their giving aid to the Jews is something that is well known and that is why people are calling them the donkeys of the Jews, they ride them for every trouble (or they are Jews hunting dogs).

SEGMENT: THE SIMILITUDE OF RAFIDAH, JEWS AND CHRISTIAN IN MANY ASPECTS

The author named his book “Minhajul Karamah fi-Ma’arifatul Imamah” (The Path of Honor In Knowing Imamah - leadership) but it is more worthy to be named as “Minhajun Nadamah” (The Path to Regret), just like the one who is claiming to be clean while Allah’s wish is not to purify his heart; nay he is of the people who follows false objects of worship, the ones who exceed all bounds and the hypocrites. It is better to describe him with being impure, adulterated and contaminated than being pure and clean. One of the greatest adulteration and corruption of the heart is to hold enmity and hatred to the bests of believers (the Prophet’s companions) and the grand friends of Allah after the Messengers; this is why Allah forbids giving out spoil of war to anyone after them other than those who are says: **“... Our Lord! Forgive us and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who have believed. Our Lord! You are indeed full of kindness, Most Merciful” (59:10).**

That is why between them (Shia Rafidah) and the Christians there are similarities in exaggeration (ghuluw), ignorance, following vain desires and other traits of the Christians; they are still being compared in their similitude and where they look alike in their traits by people. Among those who knew their characteristics very well are Imam Sha’abi and his like of the scholars of Kufa (the town of Kufa is the early center of Shiism). Imam Sha’abi says concerning them: “I never see a people more imprudent than the Shia, if to say they are among the birds they would have been owls and if to say they are from the animals they would have been donkeys. I swear by Allah if I asked them to fill my house with gold as payment for fabricating a hadith in favor Imam Ali (r.a) they will give me (such amount). I swear by Allah, I will never do that.”

Abu Hafsah bin Shahin^[13] in the book: Lutf fil- Sunnah: “On the authority of Muhammad bin Abil Qasim bin Harun, on the authority of Ahmad bin Walid al-Wasity, on the authority of Ja’afar bin Naseer al-

Tusi al-Wasity, on the authority of Abdurrahman bin Malik bin Ghoul, on the authority of his father, who said; Imam Sha'abi says; 'I warn you against the people of misguiding, innovation and vain desires, the most evil of them is the Shia Rafidah; they did not enter Islam for hope or fear but due to their hatred of the Muslims and in order to devise against it (Islam) from within. Imam Ali (during his life time) burnt some of them and exiled others.'"

Among them is Abdullah bin Saba, a Jew from Sana'a (a city in Yemen) who was exiled to Sababat (in Iran), and Abdullah bin Yasar who was exiled to Khazar. The sign of this is that the ordeal of the Shia Rafidah is similar to that of the Jews: The Jews said nobody deserves to be a king but a person from Prophet's David's (a.s) family and the Shia said nobody deserves to be an Imam (leader) but a person from the family of Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a). The Jews says Jihad (fighting in the cause of Allah) has been suspended until the appearance of Anti-Christ and descending of a sword from the sky and the Shia says there will be no Jihad in the path of Allah until the appearance of the Mahdi and a caller made an announcement (on Jihad) from the sky. The Jews delays Magrib (sunset) prayer until the stars are ablaze in the sky and the Shia act likewise. And this contradicted the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah for he said: ***"My community will continue to be on natural disposition (the correct religion) as per as they didn't delay sunset prayer until the stars are ablaze"*** (Abu Dawud, Ibn Majah, Ahmad). The Jews (while praying) divert a little from their Qiblat (direction of prayer) and Shia does the same thing. The Jews close their eyes while praying and Shia does the same thing. The Jews do not stipulate waiting period for divorced women, so also Shia Rafidah. The Jews altered Torah and Shia Rafidah altered the Qur'an. The Jews says Allah made obligatory for them fifty prayers and Shia says the same thing. The Jews do not sincerely great Muslims for they would say to them as-Sam alaikum (death be on you), so do Shia Rafidah. The Jews don't eat some types of fishes such as catfish, perch and fish fins; so also Shia Rafidah.^[14] The Jews do not eat rabbits and spleen, so do Rafidah. The Jews do not wipe on socks in ablution, so also Shia

Rafidah. The Jews believed that people's properties are allowed for them to take and squander; the same with regard to Shia Rafidah.^[15] Allah informed us about the saying of the Jews in the Qur'an: "... ***Because they (Jews) say: 'There is no blame on us to betray and take the properties of the illiterates...'***" (4:75).

The Jews allowed the spilling of the blood of all Muslims and Shia Rafidah allows killing of Muslims (see footnote 15 above). The Jews believed in cheating people, so also Shia Rafidah (through deception and simulation - Taqiyyah). The Jews placed the side of their foreheads (and not their foreheads) in Morning Prayer and Shia Rafidah does the same. The Jews do not bow down in prayer until they nod their heads many times and Rafidah does the same thing. The Jews despise Gabriel, and they say, "He is our enemy from amongst the Angels." The Shia Rafidah say; "Gabriel made a mistake in giving the revelation to Prophet Muhammad (saw) – instead of Ali."

Shia Rafidah agrees with Christian in one trait; the Christian women are not given dowry for they are enjoyed for pleasure, the same thing with regard to Rafidah creed; they conduct temporary marriage and allow temporary marriage. The Jews and Christians are better than the Shia, for when the Jews are asked, who have ever been the best of all the Jews, they replied: "The companions of Moses" and when the Christians are asked who are the best of all Christians that have existed, they said: "The companions of Jesus." And when the Shia were asked who are the worst amongst the Muslims that ever existed, they replied: "The Companions of Prophet Muhammad." They are commanded to seek forgiveness for them but they are abusing them. Thus, the sword is drawn against them to the Last Day, their call will be defeated, their flag will be vanquished and their affairs will be in disarray; whenever they kindled the fire of war Allah extinguishes it, they are striving to cause mischief in the earth and Allah do not like mischief makers.

Abdurrahman bin Malik bin Goul on the authority of his father who said: I asked 'Amir al-Sha'abi; "What do you say about those people (Shia) for you have been one of their leaders." He replied: "I saw

believing in things that have no basis.” Then he said: “O Malik! If I want them to become my slaves or that they fill my home for me with gold so that I lie for Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a), they will do so; but I will never do that. O Malik! I studied sects of innovators and followers of vain desires and I never saw any group more imprudent than Rafidah; if to say they are birds they would have been owls and if to say they are animals they would have been donkeys. O Malik! They did not enter into the fold of Islam seeking for Allah’s reward or fearing His wrath, but they did so for their hatred of Allah and their evil plotting against the Muslims (from within). They want to interpolate and destroy Islam just like the way Paul bin Yusha’u the king of the Jews destroyed the Christian religion; and their prayers do not pass their ears. Imam Ali (r.a) has burnt some of them with fire and exiled others. Among them is Abdullah bin Saba a Jew from Sana’a whom he exiled to Sababat and Abubakar bin al-Kurus whom he exiled to al-Jabiyah; he also burnt some of them who come to him and said: “You are He.” He asked them: “Who am I?” they replied: “You are our Lord.” He kindled the fire and pushed them into it. It was concerning them that Imam Ali (r.a) said:

When I perceived a detestable affair
and invited Qambara

I kindled my fire

I pushed them one by one into it
take heed

So that Muslims will

SEGMENT: THE BEGINNING OF CALLING SHIA RAFIDAH AND ZAIDIYYAH

I say: Since the time that Imam Zaid rebelled Shia torn apart into Zaidiyyah and Rafidah, because when Imam Zaid bin Ali was asked by the Shia concerning Abubakar and Umar and he sought Allah's forgiveness for them some of them rejected him and he said: "You have rejected me (Rafadtumuni رافضتموني)! Thereafter those who rejected him were called Rafidah (the rejecters رافضة) and those who did not reject him were known as Zaidiyyah because they remained with him. When he was killed and crucified on a wood some of them go to it in the night in order to perform acts of worship.

Imam Sha'abi died at the beginning of the reign of Hisham and at the end of the reign of Yazid bin Abdulmalik his brother in the year 150AH or closer to that, and the word Rafidah is not known at that time. This is one of the ways by which fabricated hadiths are uncovered for containing the word Rafidah, for Shia are known with other names and they used to be known as Khashabiyyah (those with wood), because of their saying: "We will fight with sword only with an infallible Imam." Thus they used to fight with woods. That is why some narrations come from Sha'abi stating: I never saw people more imprudent than Khashabiyyah (the owners wood), and thus whoever reported the word Rafidah from him does so by employing the meaning of what is intended.

When we say that Rafidah does so and so, we mean by that some of them do so. Just like Allah has said: **"And the Jews say: 'Ezra is the son of Allah, and the Christians say: Messiah is the son of Allah...' (9:30). And He said again: 'The Jews say: 'Allah's Hand is tied up (i.e. He does not give and spend of His Bounty)..'" (5:64).** It is not all Jews (and Christians) that says that, but there are among them who says (and believe) that and what we mentioned exists among Shia Rafidah. And there are manifold of what has been mentioned, for instance some of them forbid the eating of the meat of goose and camels (see Leviticus, 11:4), and like their joining two prayer at all times, thus they do not pray but in three periods of the

day just like the Jews. They also said that divorce is illegal until some people witnessed it for the husband just like the Jews. They also said that the bodies of all Muslims other than them and that of people of the Book are impure,^[16] they forbid eating meat of the animal they (Muslims and people of the Book) slaughter, they declared whatever touches that of water and watery substances as impure and washing the plates from which other than them eats (or drink before using it); in all these they are similar to Samaras sect of the Jews and that is why Muslims considered them like Samaras sect of the Jews. They also employ simulation (taqiyyah), always displaying the opposite of what is their hearts of enmity just like the Jews. There are many instances of their similar traits.

SEGMENT: SOME IRRATIONALITIES OF SHIA RAFIDAH

Their (Shia Rafida) foolishness (and superstitious beliefs) are too many, for instance they do not drink from a channel that have been dug by Yazid bin Mu'awiyah although the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and those who are with him (r.a) used to drink from wells and channels that have been dug by unbelievers. Some of them do not eat the fruits of the tree *detarium senegalense* (التوت الشامي) because it is brought from Syria, although it is well known that the Messenger of Allah and his companions used to eat cheese that are brought from non Muslim countries and they wore what have been manufactured by unbelievers. Nay, most of their clothes are manufactured by non-Muslims.

They also hate to talk about the number ten, or committing any action that stop at ten, even when they erect building they do not construct it on ten pillars or ten columns. All these because they hated the ten companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) who have been promised Paradise; Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Talha, Zubair, Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas, Sa'id bin Zaid bin 'Amr bin Nufail, Abdurrahman bin 'Auf and Abu Ubaidatah bin Jarrah (r.a); they hated all those except Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a). They also hated the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar and those who gave the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) vow of allegiance under the tree; who are one thousand and four hundred men.

Undoubtedly Allah has informed us that He is pleased with them. It has come in Sahih Muslim and other books of Hadiths ***on the authority of Jabir (r.a) who said the slave of Hatib bin Abi Balta'ah (r.a) said to the Messenger of Allah: "O Messenger of Allah, I swear by Allah that Hatib will enter Hell Fire." The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) replied him saying: "You have lied for he has witnessed the campaigns of Badr and Hudaibiyyah."*** Shia Rafidah are absolving themselves from those men, nay they are absolving themselves from all the Prophets companions (r.a) except a few; a little over ten of them. It is well-known and accepted

that if we assumed that there are in the world ten numbers of the most extreme unbelievers it wouldn't be necessary to avoid that number for that reason; for instance when Allah stated: **"And there were in the city nine men (from the sons of their chiefs), who made mischief in the land, and would not reform" (47:48).** This does not necessitate shunning the number nine. Nay, the number ten has been extolled by Allah in many places in the Qur'an, like the words of Allah with regard to Mut'at (performing lesser pilgrimage and the pilgrimage) of Pilgrimage: **".. But if he cannot afford it, he should observe Saum (fasts) three days during the Hajj and seven days after his return (to his home), making ten days in all..." (2:196).** And Allah said: **"And We appointed for thirty nights and added (to the period) ten (more), and he completed the term, appointed by his Lord, of forty nights..." (7:142).** Again Allah said: **"By the dawn; By the ten nights (i.e. the first ten days of the month of Dhul-Hijjah)" (89"1-2).** It has been the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to enter into seclusion in the last ten days of Ramadan (the month of fasting) (Bukhari and Muslim). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said concerning the Lailatul Qadr (The Night of Power): ***"You shall look for it in the last ten days of Ramadan" (Bukhar, Muslim).*** The Messenger of Allah also said: ***"There are no days in which good righteous act are more loved by Allah than those ten days" (Bukhari, Tirmidhi).*** There are a lot of these types of hadiths. It is surprising that they love the number nine, but they hated nine of the ten, for they hated them except Ali (r.a). They also shun and avoid the names Abubakar or Umar or Uthman and they avoid whoever is named with one of those names to the extent of hating to do any transaction with him. It is well known that even if those people are the greatest unbelievers among all human beings, there is no law that forbids bearing their names. Among the Prophets companions there is a person who is called Walid and the Messenger of Allah used to supplicate in his prayer: ***"O Allah make Walid bin Walid bin Mughirah succeed" (Bukhari);*** although his father is one of the greatest unbelievers and the only one who is mentioned in the Qur'an: **"Leave Me Alone (to deal) with whom I created Alone" (74:11).** Among the Prophets

companions there are those whose name is 'Amr and among the polytheists there are those whose names is 'Amr such as 'Amr bin Abdoud and Abu Jahal's name is 'Amr bin Hisham. Among the companions there is Khalid bin Sa'id bin 'As who is among the first to embrace Islam and among the polytheists there is Khalid bin Sufyan al-Huzaili.

Among the Prophets companions there are those whose names are Hisham, like Hisham bin Hukain, and Abu Jahal is called Abi Hisham. Among the companions there are those whose names is 'Aqabah, like Abi Mas'ud 'Aqabah bin 'Aqabah bin 'Amr al-Badri and 'Aqabah bin 'Amir al-Juhni and among the polytheists there is 'Aqabah bin Abi Mu'ait.

Among the companions of the Prophet there are those whose names is Ali and Uthman and among the unbelievers there are those whose names are Ali, like Ali bin 'Umayyah bin Khalaf who was killed in the battle of Badr as an unbeliever and likewise with regard to Uthman like Uthman bin Talha who was killed as an unbeliever. There are many of these instances. Therefore, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his companions (r.a) never hate being identified with a name just because one of the unbelievers is identified with it. So even if it is assumed that Muslims that are identified with those names are unbelievers that did not necessitate hating those names for the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) used to call people with them and approve for others to call them with those names.

Many among the Shia Rafidah believed that they (Abubakar and Umar etc.) have been hypocrites and that the Messenger of (s.a.w) knew that they are hypocrites and yet he is calling them with those names. Ali bin Abi Talib has named his children with those names and it is known that identifying with those names whether the person is an unbeliever or a Muslim is accepted in religion. Thus, whoever detests identifying anybody with it is one of the greatest men that contradicted the religion of Islam. In addition to the aforementioned if, a person is named Ali, or Ja'afar, or Hasan or Husain etc. they transact with him and honor him although they have no proof whether he is one of them.

One of their silliness is that they have created a lot of waiting for places (where they assembled from time time) for their awaited Imam (Mahdi), like the cave in Samarra in which they are claiming that he hid inside it. There are other assemblies that they make by converging in a particular place with either a mule or a horse etc., so that he (the awaited Mahdi) can ride it when he came out and they assembled there either in the morning or in the evening or in other periods and somebody will be calling him to come out saying: "O our master come out!" And they will be brandishing weapons although nobody is there to fight them. Among them are those who will be standing at the assembly ground persistently and continuously without observing compulsory prayers, for fear that if he goes to pray the Mahdi will appear and he will miss his coming out and serving him. They do this even if they are in faraway places from the place of assembly i.e. in the Madina of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and especially in the last ten days of Ramadan. In other times they will move towards the east calling with loud raised voices for the awaited Mahdi to come out and appear before them. Now, it is known out of necessity if he exist and Allah asked him to appear he will appear whether they call upon him or not and if he is not commanded by Allah to appear he will not accept their call. If he appear by the command of Allah, He will aid him, provide him with mount and supporters and aids and thus, he will not need those who are standing always waiting for him of men whose efforts has been wasted in this life while they thought that they are acquiring good by their deeds. Allah the Exalted has faulted in His Book those who call who will never answer their calls: **"... And those, whom you invoke or call upon instead of Him, own not even a Qitmir (the thin membrane over the date stone). If you invoke (or call upon) them, they hear not your call, and if (in case) they were to hear, they could not grant it (your request) to you. And on the Day of Resurrection, they will disown your worshipping them. And none can inform you (O Muhammad) like Him Who is the All-Knower (of each and everything)" (35:13-14).** This, although idols are present (in contrast to the hidden, none existent Mahdi) and sometimes devils seems to appear to them and speak to them.

The one who is calling upon the nonexistent is in a worse and eviler situation than the one who is calling the existent even if it is a non-living thing. Thus, whoever is calling upon the awaited Mahdi that has not been created by Allah is more astray than those people (worshippers of idols). If he (a Rafidi) say: "I believe in his existence;" that is just like the claim of those people when they say we believe that these idols will intercede for us before Allah; thus they are worshipping that which will neither benefit them nor harm them and they are saying those are our intercessors with Allah.

What we intending to explain is that each of them is calling upon those who will not benefit him even though those people took for intercessors idols and these people are saying he is an infallible Imam and they live for him and hate for him like the way the polytheists love their idols. They made that to be a pillar of faith, whoever does not believe in that he is not a believer, just as some polytheists take their idols in similar manner. Allah said: **"It is not (possible) for any human being to whom Allah has given the Book and Al-Hukma (the knowledge and understanding of the laws of religion, etc.) and Prophethood to say to the people: "Be my worshippers rather than Allah's." On the contrary, (he would say): "Be you Rabbaniyun (learned men of religion who practice what they know and also preach others), because you are teaching the Book, and you are studying it." Nor would he order you to take angels and Prophets for lords (gods). Would he order you to disbelieve after you have submitted to Allah's Will?" (3:79-80).** If this the condition of those who took Angels and Prophet as lords other than Allah, then how about the one who take a non-existent Imam that is never real? Allah the Exalted has said: **"They (Jews and Christians) took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah (by obeying them in things which they made lawful or unlawful according to their own desires without being ordered by Allah), and (they also took as their Lord) Messiah, son of Mary, while they (Jews and Christians) were commanded (in the Torah and the Gospel) to worship none but One God (Allah) none has the right to be worshipped**

but He. Praise and glory be to Him, (far above is He) from having the partners they associate (with Him)." (9:31). It is recorded in Tirmidhi and other books of hadiths that 'Adiy bin Hatim said: ***"O Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); 'They do not worship them.' He replied: 'They have allowed for them the forbidden and forbids for them the allowed and they obey them; that is their worship of them.'"*** Those are human beings who took existing people as lords.

Those people (Shia Rafidah) are making the allowed and the forbidden hinged upon non-existent Imam, who has no reality and then they practice whatever he (they are told he says by those who are claiming his existence – Shia scholars) he forbids or allows even if that contradicted the Book (Qur'an), the Sunnah and consensus of the Islamic community, to the extent that if their group has two divergent views, then the view of the one whose source is unknown is the right one because (according to them) it is the words of their (non-existent) infallible Imam; they made allowed what he allows and forbidden what he forbids; this person that does not exist. And even among those who claims that he exists, nobody knew him and nobody can be able to transmit from him even one word.

Among their foolishness are their portrayal and depicting those who they hold hatred against (as animals or some objects), for instance they take hold of an ewe, especially if it is a red ewe because Aisha (wife of the Prophet) is known as the red; they will represent the ewe as Aisha (r.a) and they will be torturing it by plucking and pulling its hair etc. and they considered doing so as punishing Aisha (r.a). Another example is that they will fill a saddle blanket with butter and then they will tear make holes in it and as the butter flows out they will be drinking it and be saying this is just like beating Umar (r.a) and drinking his blood. And yet another instance is some of them would name two donkeys of millstone one of them as Abubakar and the other as Umar (r.a) and then they will be overburdening and tasking those two donkeys saying that they are punishing Abubakar and Umar (r.a). Sometimes they will write the names of Abubakar and Umar (r.a) under the bottoms of their feet to the extent that some

rulers will be flogging the bottoms of their feet, saying: "I am only beating Abubakar and Umar and I will continue beating them until I kill them." There are among them who named their dogs after Abubakar and Umar (r.a) and he will be cursing them and among them there are those if his dog is called Abubakar he will fight the person who says that and say: "Do you name my dog after denizen of the fire?"

Among them there are those who honor Abu Lu'ulu'u the unbeliever, Magian (Zoroastrian) who was a slave to Mughirah bin Shu'ubah (r.a) because he killed Umar (r.a) and you hear them saying: "Rise for revenge to Abu Lu'ulu'u." Thereby honoring an unbeliever, Magian by the consensus of Muslims, just because he murdered Umar (r.a).

Among there foolishness are creating designating places as shrines and mostly they are telling lies to people, claiming that it was buried in this place a member of the Prophet's family. They might claim that he was killed and they will convert the place into a built up shrine, while in reality the grave might be that of an unbeliever or other person; they will broadcast that with many signs.

(With regard to Shia Rafidah who torture animals as Prophets companions), it is well known that punishing animals that are called with those names cannot be done but by the most foolish of people and the most ignorant among them. It is well known that if we want to punish Pharaoh, or Abu Lahab or Abu Jahl and other people who are known as the greatest unbelievers by the consensus of all Muslims with those kinds of punishments, that will only be the greatest display of ignorance because that is not beneficial. Nay, if an unbeliever whose killing is allowed has been slayed or he died naturally it is not allowed after killing him or his death to disrespect or mutilate his body, and thus his stomach cannot be punctured, his nose or ear or hand cannot be cut unless in likewise treatment (as a form of revenge).

It is recorded by Muslim and other hadith compendiums on the authority of Buraidah (r.a), that if the Messenger of Allah commissioned a leader over an army or a detachment, he will advise

him to fear Allah in himself, to treat those with him of the Muslim with good conduct and he would say: ***“Fight in the cause of Allah, and fight those who disbelieve in Allah but do not go to the extreme, do not betray, do not mutilate, and do not kill children” (Muslim)***. It come in Sunan of Abu Dawud that the Messenger of Allah used to command in his sermons the giving of charity and the forbiddance of mutilating (dead bodies). This although mutilating the dead body of an unbeliever is a form of punishing the enemy but he forbade it because it is a form of adding unnecessary injury, for the aim is to prevent his evil by killing him and that has been achieved. Therefore, those who they (the Shia) hated even if they are unbelievers they are already dead and thus, it is not for them to mutilate their bodies, or beat them, or pierce their stomachs or to pluck their hair although it is a form of punishing them and if they do so to other things (living or non-living) thinking that they are punishing them, that is the biggest ignorance. Then, how about if such treatments are meted on what it is forbidden to torture or harm such as an ewe? They are doing what will never benefit them but what will bring upon them harm in this world and the Hereafter and it is a display of the greatest foolishness and ignorance.

Among their foolishness is holding gatherings and mourning assemblies for those who have been killed several years ago. It is well known that if the one who has been killed does the same thing to them, he is committing what Allah and His Messenger has forbidden. It has come in Sahihain (Bukhari and Muslim) that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“He who slaps the cheeks, tears the clothes and follows the traditions of the Days of Ignorance is not from us.”*** Hadiths has come in the Sahihain in which the Messenger of Allah absolved himself from women who shave their hair in mourning or lamented loudly or tore her clothes. In another hadith the Messenger of Allah said: ***“The deceased is punished for the (the loud) wailing of his relatives over him” (Bukhari and Muslim)***. In another sound hadith the Messenger of Allah said: ***“If the wailing woman does not repent before she dies, she will be made to stand on the Day of Resurrection wearing a garment of***

pitch and a chemise of mange” (Muslim). There are many more hadith in this regard and those people (Shia) slap their faces, tear their clothes, make speeches of the ignorant and commit other detestable acts after death a long time ago. If they commit those conduct immediately after the death of the dead man they have committed detestable forbidden acts. Then how about carrying out such actions after death a long time ago?

It is well known that a lot of Prophets and those who are not Prophets have been murdered unjustly and aggressively and they are better than Husain (r.a), for the murder of his father unjustly is more than his murder, so also the murder of Uthman (r.a), and his (murder) is the first great tribulation that occurred after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and which led to a lot of evil and mischief more than what occurred over the killing of Husain (r.a). Other than those mentioned were killed and died and nobody among the Muslims or other than them plan mourning assemblies of wailing for the dead and neither for a killed person after a long period of his death except what those ignorant irrational people do. If to say they (Shia Rafidah) are bird they would have been owls and if to they are animals they would have been donkeys.^[17] Among their irrationality and foolishness is that some of them do not light the wood from the Tamarisk tree because he was told that the blood of Husain drops on a Tamarisk tree when he was murdered and it is well known that the particular tree's wood will not be a taboo with regard to burning any part of it no matter whose blood smears or falls on it. Then, how about the trees that have not been smeared by his blood?

They have a lot of other rashness and foolishness which mentioning will be endless and there is no need to mention the chains of narrators for those narrations, but our goal is to show that since time immemorial people are describing them with these types of foolishness and irrationalities. Since the time of those who come after the companions and those who come after them and up to today (they are still practicing absurdities). It is necessary to note that what is being described of the detestable and incorrigible traits of Shia of words and actions; although we have mentioned only very

few of their absurdities, but all of it might not be of the practice of the Shia Imamiyyah Ithna Ashariyyah or Zaidiyyah, but most of it will be found with the Shia extremists (such as Ithna Ashariyyah Rafidah, Jarudiyyah, Isma'iliyyah etc.) and among most of their commonalities. There are other things, similar to what has been mentioned concerning them, such as forbidding the meat of camels and that divorce is conditional upon the consent of the woman and other things that are held by the common people among them, although (some of) their scholars are not saying that; but due to the fact that the principle of their creed is based on ignorance, there is more ignorance and lies among them than in other sects.

SEGMENT: VERDICT OF MUSLIMS SCHOLARS ON SHI RAFIDAH

We will explain – by the grace of Allah and His aid – the path of righteousness as we have named that book the path to regret – by the Power and strength of Allah. This man has followed the footsteps of his predecessors, the scholars of Rafidah, such as Ibn Mu'aman al-Mufid and those who followed him such as Karajiki, Abul Qasim al-Musawi, Tusi and others like them.

Absolutely, Shia Rafidah are not men of knowledge and experience with the methodologies of debates, argumentations and identifying evidences and what they contained of exceptions and contradictions. They are also ignorant with regard to textual evidences; hadiths and Sunnah and differentiating between its sound and its weak narrations. Their reliance with regard to textual evidences is totally on historical narrations that have cut off chains of authorities and those who are known to be liars and or atheists have fabricated most of it. There scholars depended in their acceptance of textual evidences on people like Abi Mikhnaf Lut bin Yahaya and Hisham al-Kalbi and others like them who are known to be liars by those who possess knowledge. Those are the best type of people upon whom they rely in accepting hadiths narrations for they use to defend and accept hadiths from those who are crass ignorant, liars who are not even mentioned in books of biographies and those who are versed in the science of biographies of those who transmitted hadiths knew nothing about them.

Scholars who are versed in transmission of hadith, its narration and the science of chain of transmitters of hadith have all agreed upon the fact that Shia Rafidah are the greatest liar among all sects (that ascribe themselves to Islam). Lying among them is of old and that is why Muslim scholars knew that they are specialist in telling too much liars.

Abu Hatim ar-Razi said he heard Yunus bin Abdul 'Ala saying, Ashhab bin Abdul 'Aziz said: Imam Malik was asked about Rafidah and he replied; "Don't talk to them and report (hadith) from them for

they are liars.” Abu Hatim said, Harmala informed us that he heard Imam Shafi’i saying: “I never see a people that give false witness more than Rafidah.” Mu’umil bin Ahab said, I heard Yazid bin Harun saying: “We write knowledge (accept hadith) from all innovators, if he does not propagate his innovation except Rafidah, for they are liars.” Muhammad bin Sa’id al-Isfahani said, I heard Shuraik saying: “Take (accept) knowledge from whoever you meet except Rafidah, for they fabricate hadiths and take it as religion.” This man Shuraik is Shuraik bin Abdullah al-Qadi, he is the judge of Kufa and a contemporary of Imam ath-Thawri and Imam Abu Hanifa said, he is among the (moderate) Shia, who used to say that he is a Shia and yet this is his verdict regarding them. Abu Mu’awiyah said, I heard al-‘Amash saying: “I meet people and they do not identify them but as liars.” He means the companions of Mughirah bin Sa’id. Al-‘Amash said: “There is no problem if you remember this; because I do not feel at ease from their side for one day they will say we caught al-‘Amash with a woman (meaning they are slanderers).” What we are aiming at narrating these is to prove that all scholars have agreed that lying among Rafidah is more pronounced than in any other sect of the sects that affiliate themselves to Islam.

The source of Shia Rafidah’s innovation is Zandaqah^[18] and atheism. Lying intentionally among them is universal, they confess this fact when they states that our religion is based on simulation (Taqiyyah), which means one of them will utter with his tongue what contradicts what is in his heart, and this is lying and hypocrisy and they are saying that they are the only believers among the rest of the Muslims. They are describing the first and foremost to embrace Islam (Muhajirun and Ansar) as apostates and hypocrites. They are the embodiment of the maxim: “She shot me with her defect and slip away.” This is because there is no sect among those who affiliate themselves to Islam who are closer to hypocrisy and apostasy more than them and you will not find apostates and hypocrites in any sect in such a large number as you will find among their sects, just consider on this note the extremist among the Nusairiyyah and others, consider also the heretics, Ismailiyyah and their like.

They rely in jurisprudence on what has been related to them from some members of the Prophet's family (progeny), and in what is narrated to them there is what is sound and there is what is intentional liars or mistake. They are not endowed with the knowledge of sound transmitted narrations and its weak ones like the scholars of hadiths and even if narrations are sound from those men, the Shia Rafidah has built accepting a narration of one of those people upon three principles: On that, any one of those is infallible just like the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). (Secondly), on that, whatever one of those says is saying it on the authority of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), and they are claiming infallibility in that transmission. Thirdly, on that, the consensus of the Prophet's progeny is an authority and then they are claiming that the Prophet's progeny are twelve men and that whatever any of them stated has been agreed upon by all of them. This then is their principles of jurisprudence and it is false principles – we will explain this in the right place. They do not rely on Qur'an and neither on hadith and they do accept the consensus of the Muslim community except if an infallible Imam is among them. They do not also accept analogy even if it is very clear. With regard to their intellectual argumentations and theories their latter scholars depend completely on the books of Mu'tazilites. The Mu'tazilites are more rational than them and more truthful and none among the Mu'tazilites is condemning the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (r.a); nay, they have all agreed upon the caliphate of those three. With regard to appraising the best person after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); they (the early Mu'tazilites) generally prefer Abubakar and then Umar (r.a), but their latter generation use to tarry when it come to preference and some of them prefer Ali (r.a) and thus between them and Zaidiyyah there is a relationship in beliefs; Oneness of Allah, justice, Imamah (leadership) and preference.

CHAPTER ONE: ON SHIA RAFIDAH'S CLAIM THAT IMAMAH IS THE MOST IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE OF RELIGION

The Shia Rafidi writer stated, after that: "This is an honored treatise and a pleasant statement, it contained the most important principles of religious precepts and the greatest religious issues, which is the issue of Imamah (leadership) and which cognizant will lead to the acquisition of the noblest station. It is one of the pillars of belief by which people deserve eternal life in Paradise and escape from the anger of the Most Merciful. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has said: "Whoever died without knowing the Imam (leader) of his time has died the death of ignorance." I am serving (by writing this book) the great Sultan, ruler of the community, the King of Kings of Arabs and non-Arabs, the Shahinsha (king of Kings), the supporter of truth, creed and religion, Ulijayo Khudabanda.^[19] I summarized in it precise evidences, and pointed to the main issues and named it The Path of Honor in Knowing Imamah (leadership); I have arranged it into chapters. The first chapter is concerning the opinions of sects with regard to this issue. The second chapter is on the incumbency of following the sect of Shia Imamiyyah. The third chapter is on the evidences concerning the Imamah of Imam Ali after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). The fourth chapter is on concerning the twelve (Imams). And the fifth chapter is on nullifying the caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman."

I (Ibn Taimiyyah) say replying the above claims is from many approaches:

First approach, your stating that the issue of Imamah (leadership) is the most important principle of religious precepts and the greatest religious issues is a lie by consensus of Muslims; both the Ahlus Sunnah and the Shia, nay it is unbelief, because believe in Allah and His Messenger is more important than the issue of Imamah. This is known by necessity in the religion of Islam, for an unbeliever will not become a Muslim until he witness that there is nobody worthy of

being worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad (s.a.w) is his Messenger. This is the issue upon which the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) fought unbelievers, as it has been related in sound books of hadith that he said: ***“I was commanded to fight until people believe that there is no one who is worthy of being worshipped but Allah and that I am the Messenger of Allah, that they shall uphold prayer, pay the poor due (Zakat), if they have done that they have preserved from me their bloods and properties, but by its right” (Bukhari and Muslim).*** Allah the exalted said: **“Then when the Sacred Months (the 1st, 7th, 11th, and 12th months of the Islamic calendar) have passed, then kill the polytheists (see V.2:105) wherever you find them, and capture them and besiege them, and prepare for them each and every ambush. But if they repent and perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, then leave their way free. Verily, Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful” (9:5).** This is what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) commanded Imam Ali (r.a) when he sent him for the campaign of Khaibar, asking him to move among the unbelievers and preserve their blood if they repented from unbelief and he never mention to them the issue of Imamah. Allah the Higher stated after that: **“But if they repent, perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat) and give Zakat, then they are your brethren in religion. (In this way) We explain the verses in detail for a people who know” (9:11).** Thus, Allah made them brothers in religion by repentance. Surely, whenever unbelievers embraced Islam at the time of the Prophet (s.a.w), they would be taught all the rules of Islam, and they are never informed of Imamah; nobody has mentioned that from among scholars, neither through special transmission nor general, nay we knew out of necessity that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) never mention to people when they want to embrace his religion the issue of Imamah neither generally and nor specifically. Then how can it be the most important principle in religious precepts? What will explain this fact further is that the issue of Imamah - if we assume the necessity of knowing it – is not needed by those who die during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Then how can we say that the noblest matter of Muslims and the most important religious principle is not

needed by anybody at the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)? Are those who believed at the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and followed him openly and secretly and they did not change and they did not apostate not the best of creations by the consensus of Muslims, both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia: then how is it that the best of created beings do not need (to know) the most important principle of religion? And the noblest matter of the Muslims?

If it is said that the Prophet (s.a.w) is the Imam (leader) during his life time and people need an Imam after his death and therefore this issue hasn't been the most important principle of religion while he is alive, but it became so after his death! We reply to this is from many angles:

1. If we assume that the above argument is correct, then it is not allowed to state that it is the most important religious issue; nay it is so in some period and not so in another period and this entailed that the issue of Imamah is not the most important principles of religious precepts and the greatest religious issues in the best century of the Muslim community.

2. That we say believe in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) in all periods and in all places is greater than the issue of Imamah. Therefore, it has never been at any time neither the most important nor the noblest issue.

3. That we say it would have been imperative for the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to explain it to the rest of his community (who will come) after him, the way he explained to them the issues of prayer, Zakat, fasting, Pilgrimage and the way he taught them believe in Allah, worshipping him alone and the Last day.

We all knew that there is no any exposition of the issue of Imamah in the Book of Allah or the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w) in the way those principles have been explained. If somebody say: Nay, Imamah in all periods is the most important and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) was the Prophet and the Imam and this is known by those who believed in him that he is the Imam of that time. We say giving this excuse is false from many angles:

i. That the statement of the one who says, Imamah is the most important principle of religious precept either means the Imamah of the twelve Imams or the Imamah of each Imam at his particular time and period and thereby it will entail the most important thing to believe in at our present period is in the Imamah of Muhammad the awaited (Mahdi), the most important at the time of the four caliphs is the Imamah of Imam Ali bin Abi Talib and the most important at the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) is his Imamah or he means believe in the complete precepts of Imamah unconditionally (without any specification) or he might have a fourth meaning. With regard to the first option, it is well known unavoidably that this issue is not known at the time of the Prophet's companions (r.a) and neither at the time of those who come after them. Nay, Shia are saying that each Imam will appoint the one that will be an Imam after him and this has nullified the claim that the issue is the most important principle of religion.

With regard to the second option, on this assumption, it will be that the most important principle of religion at each period is the believe in the Imam of that particular time and thus the Imam from the year 260AH up to today (more than one thousand two hundred years ago) is the believe in the Imamah of Muhammad bin al-Hasan al-Askari (their awaited Mahdi), and that this belief is greater and more important than the belief that there is nobody worthy of being worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is His messenger, and the belief in Allah, His Messengers, His Angels, His books and the resurrection after death, and greater and above the belief in prayer, fasting, Zakat, pilgrimage and all the obligations. Although the falsity of this claim is known unavoidably in the religion of Islam, it is not the belief of Shia Imamiyyah because the concern they are showing towards the Imamah of Ali bin Abi Talib is greater than the concern they are showing to the Imamah of the awaited Imam as has been mentioned by this writer and those similar to him among the Shia scholars. If really this is the most important principle of religion, then Shia Imamiyyah are the last people to be in this religion, because they hold to an infallible Imam that does not exists, who is not

beneficial to them in religious and worldly matters; therefore, they never benefit from the most important religious principle in any religious issue or worldly matter. And if they say, what we mean is the believe in the necessity of Imamah generally without any exception and it is the most important issue of religion, we say; this also is a false claim because it is absolutely known in religion that other than it is more important. If the Shia scholar has a fourth ground, he has to mention it so that we can reply to it.

ii. That is we say; it is compulsory to obey the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) not because he is an Imam but because he is the Messenger of Allah to people and this is a fact with regard to him when he is alive and after his death. Therefore, the imperativeness of obeying him by those who come after him is like the compulsion of obeying him by those who live during his life time and among those who live at his time there are those who witnessed him and heard his commands with regard to the allowed and the forbidden and there are those who are not present but his commands regarding the allowed and the forbidden has reached them. Just as it is compulsory for the one who is absent during his lifetime to obey his commands concerning the allowed and the forbidden, it is also compulsory for those who come after his death. His commands are absolute and all encompassing on all believers who met him or the ones who are absent from his presence during his life or after his death and this rule did not encompass any of the Imams and this is not derived from Imamah.

If the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) commands a particular people with a command or judged a particular case on particular people, that command or judgment is not restricted to those particularities but they persists (and are applicable) on similar issues and cases to the Last Day; like his words to those who are present before him: ***“Don’t bow (in prayer) before I bow and don’t prostrate before I prostrate” (Muslim, Ibn Majah).*** This is a persistent applicable command to whoever is praying behind (or with) an Imam, not to precede him in bowing or prostrating. And his words to the man who said: ***“I thought that such and such was to be done before such***

and such. I got my hair shaved before slaughtering." (Another said) I slaughtered (the sacrificial animal during pilgrimage) before doing the Rami (throwing stones to Jamrat)." So, the people asked about many similar things. The Prophet said, "Do it (now) and there is no harm in all these cases." Whenever the Prophet was asked about anything on that day, he replied, "Do it (now) and there is no harm in it" (Bukhari). This is a command for whoever falls into similar situation. Another instance is his words to Aisha when she menstruated during lesser pilgrimage: ***"Do whatever a pilgrim performs but do not circumambulate the House of Allah (Ka'abah)" (Bukhari).*** There are many more similar cases. Those who succeeded the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) after his death are like those who he appointed to some positions of authority during his life time, they command with what he allowed and forbids what he has forbidden; therefore, it is compulsory to obey whoever is commanding with the commands of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) because he is carrying his commands and because Allah sent him to people and made his obedience compulsory; not because he is an Imam who has authority and aids or because somebody has appointed him as an Imam etc. Therefore, obeying him do not stop where obeying those who have been appointed as Imams by somebody stops or because people of influence have supported him or other issue; nay it is compulsory to obey him even if nobody is with him and even if everybody rejected him.

Again obeying him in Makka before he got aids and helpers who are fighting with him is compulsory, just as Allah the Exalted stated: ***"Muhammad (SAW) is no more than a Messenger, and indeed (many) Messengers have passed away before him. If he dies or is killed, will you then turn back on your heels (as disbelievers)? And he who turns back on his heels, not the least harm will he do to Allah, and Allah will give reward to those who are grateful" (3:144).*** In this verse Allah explained that the death of His messenger (s.a.w) or being killed do not nullify the precepts of his message the way the laws of Imams are nullified by their death or after being killed and that it is not part of the conditions of his

message to be an eternal person who never die, for he is not the Lord but rather a Messenger and many Messengers have passed before him.

Undoubtedly, he (the Messenger of Allah) has conveyed the message, delivered the trust, advised the community and struggled in the path of Allah with all sincerity until death overtook him from his Lord. Thus, obeying him is obligatory after his death just as it is obligatory during his lifetime and he maintained that the religion has been completed and stabilized after his death and thus there is no abrogation of any law. That is why the Qur'an was compiled in a book form after his death because it is complete and unchanging after his death. Thus, if anybody says he was an Imam during his life time and after his death somebody has become the Imam; if he meant by that the person has become his equal, who shall be obeyed the way the Messenger of Allah(s.a.w) is obeyed. Then, this claim is false. And if he mean that the one who succeed him is discharging his commands; we say same thing happens during his life time because whenever he is not present there is somebody who succeed him. If it is stated that, after his death he cannot be able to discharge duties in contrast to when he is alive! We reply that, discharging of duties is not a condition for the obligation of obeying him for it is compulsory upon whoever is conveyed (without seeing him) his commands to obey him just as it is compulsory upon whoever heard his words directly. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has been commanding that: ***“Those who are present shall inform those who are absent and may be the one who is informed will understand more the one who hears directly” (Bukhari).*** If it is contended that during his life he used to judge on specific issues, like giving a particular person something or punishing a specific person or dispatching a particular army; we say yes and obeying him is obligatory on similar issues to the Last Day in contrast to Imams (leaders). But may be the knowledge of similar case can escape a person just like a knowledge might be unknown to a person who is not present and therefore, the one who is present knew what he has said and comprehend it better than the one who is absent, although

we may find among those who the message is conveyed unto them a person who understand it better than some listeners who are present. This is people's excelling over each other in understanding his commands and it does not entail surpassing each other in the obligation of obeying his commands. Obeying those in authority after him is like obeying those he has appointed to lead a group of Muslim during his lifetime. Thus, obeying him is incumbent on all people at the same level even though their abilities differed in conveyance, listening and understanding; some of his commands may reach some people without reaching others, some people will hear his command which others will not hear and some people will understand from his command what others cannot understand; and whoever gives an order with what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) commanded, he shall be necessarily be obeyed for Allah and His messenger (s.a.w).

If people have appointed an able leader, who has strength and authority and follows the commands of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and then he command with the commands of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and direct with his directives, his affairs will be straight and even. Thus, it is not allowed to appoint somebody as a leader other than him. It is not possible to find a person who is like the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) after his death, but we can find a person who is close to him and who more deserves to succeed him (s.a.w); the person who more deserves to succeed the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is the one who is closer to command with his commandments and forbid what he has forbidden. It is well known that most of the times a person is not obeyed unless if he has enough power and authority by which he can compel people to obedience. Therefore, he must have followers who are ready to sacrifice their lives in order to ensure obedience to him. All what the religion entailed is obedience to Allah and His Messenger and obeying Allah and His Messenger is all what the religion entailed and therefore, whoever obeyed the Messenger of Allah has obeyed Allah.

The religion of the Muslims after the death of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is obeying Allah and His Messenger, and their obeying the one with authority in what they have been commanded to obey him, which is obeying Allah and His Messenger. The commands of the one in authority are the commands that Allah and His Messenger directed him to apply and his allotments and judgments are in obedience to Allah and His Messenger; thus, the conducts of those in authority and the Muslim community during the life of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and after his death in what Allah loves and is pleased with, are obedience to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). And that is why the main principle of religion is bearing witness that there is nobody who is worthy of being worshipped but Allah and bearing witness that Muhammad (s.a.w) is the Messenger of Allah. So if it said, he has been an Imam and they mean by that an Imamah outside of Messengerhood, or an Imamah which has conditions that are not found in Messengerhood, or an Imamah in which he (the Imam) is obeyed outside obedience to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); then all these are falsehood because all obedience to him must be within his Messengerhood and whatever obedience is given to him, it is bestowed to him because he is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and if it is assumed that he is just an Imam he will not be obeyed until obedience to him is within obedience to another Prophet. Therefore, obedience is bestowed only to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and to those who the Messengers directed to be obeyed.

If it is contended that his Imamah is obeyed within his Messengerhood, then this is not effective, because simply being a Messenger is enough to make obedience to him obligatory in contrast to an Imam for he will only become an Imam with aids who execute his directives otherwise he is just like other scholars and religious men. If it is contended that when he became the one with authority in Madina, he became both a Messenger and a just Imam. We say: Nay, he became a Messenger with helpers who execute his commands and fight whoever reject his affair, and as per as there are those who believe in Allah and His Messenger on the face of the

earth they will continue carrying out his commands and fighting those who reject his affairs, therefore he benefitted from helpers more than an Imam and do not need to add Imamah to his Messengerhood because all the responsibilities of Imams are within his Messengerhood. The acquisition of aids and helpers bestowed upon him perfect ability and obligated upon him many matters and fighting in the cause of Allah which may not be obligatory without ability, for laws differ due to differential ability, inability, knowledge and lack of it, it also differ with differential affluence or poverty and health or sickness. And the believer obeys Allah in all that and he is also obeying the Messenger of Allah in all that and Muhammad the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is obeying Allah in all what He has commanded and what He has forbidden.

If the Shia Imamiyyah says: Imamah is necessary rationally and intellectually in contrast to Prophethood and therefore it is the most important from this consideration. We say: There is disagreement with regard to rational or intellectual necessity and we will explain this latter. If we assume rational necessity, then what it necessitated with regard to Imamah is just a fraction of the parts of intellectual necessities such as Oneness of Allah, truthfulness, justice and other things that the intellect made necessary. Undoubtedly, Messengerhood is part of that necessity because Imamah is a fraction of Messengerhood for goal of an Imam is attained in belief in the Messenger during his life and after he has died in contrast to Imamah. And again whoever bears witness that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and that obeying him is obligatory and exerts efforts in obeying him according to his ability, if it said that he will enter Paradise that suffices us over the issue of Imamah. And if it is said that he will not enter Paradise, we say that this has contradicted Qur'anic texts because Allah the Sublime has promised Paradise to whoever obeyed Allah and His Messenger in more than one place, like His Words: **“These are the limits (set by) Allah (or ordainments as regards laws of inheritance), and whosoever obeys Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad) will be admitted to Gardens under which rivers flow (in Paradise), to abide therein,**

and that will be the great success” (4:13). And: “And whoso obeys Allah and the Messenger (Muhammad), then they will be in the company of those on whom Allah has bestowed His Grace, of the Prophets, the Siddiqun (those followers of the Prophets who were first and foremost to believe in them, like Abubakar AsSiddiq), the martyrs, and the righteous. And how excellent these companions are! (4:69).

Furthermore, the Imam of the time (their awaited Mahdi) whom they are inviting people to believe in him; there is no way anybody can know him or reach him and there is no way anybody can know what he is commanding or what he is forbidding or what he is informing them. Then, if person cannot attain happiness (Paradise) until he obey the person whose commands (whether on the allowed or the forbidden) are not known, it will entail that nobody will be able to succeed or be successful or acquire happiness or obey Allah and this is one of the biggest examples of obligating the impossible (giving a directive that is impossible to be executed or be carried out) and they are the greatest people that cannot be able to succeed. If it said that, he (the awaited Imam) is commanding what Shia Imamiyyah believed in (and practice). We say: Then there is no need for his existence or even seeing or knowing him, for that is known (his teachings), whether he is alive or dead and whether he is present or hidden. If it is possible to know what Allah has commanded His slaves without this awaited Imam, then it is known that he is not necessary and not needed for obeying Allah and the success of somebody or his happiness is not hinged on him. Therefore, there is no need to speak about the Imamah of this person, let alone talking about the obligation of his Imamah. This is a very clear issue for the one who ponder over it.

But then again Shia Rafidah are among the most ignorant men because it is well known that the rational and legal necessities are either hinged upon what this awaited Imam command of the allowed and the forbidden or they are not hinged upon that. If they are hinged upon that then this entailed burdening people with the impossible (taxing them to do what they cannot be able to do); that means

carrying out the obligations and shunning the forbidden are hinged upon a condition that generality of the people cannot be able to fulfill. Nay, nobody among them (can be able to fulfill it) because nobody in this earth can make a truthful claim he has seen the awaited Imam or heard his words. If they (doing good and shunning evil) are not hinged (upon commands of the awaited Mahdi) then people can perform rational and legal necessities and they can shun things that are rationally and legally reprehensible without the awaited Mahdi; thus he is not needed, his existence is not obligatory and seeing (knowing) him is not necessary.

The Shia Rafidah hinged people's success, their bliss and their obedience to Allah and His Messenger upon an impossible, prohibitive condition, nobody can be able to achieve that and none of them can be able to achieve it. They informed people nobody can escape the punishment of Allah unless with that, he will never attain happiness unless with that and none can be a believer unless with that. Now they must accept one of the following: Either that their belief is false or that Allah has made prohibitive His mercy upon His slaves and that He has decreed punishment upon all human beings; both Muslims and non-Muslims. On this consideration they are the first unfortunate men who will be in eternal damnation and perdition, because nobody among them has a means of knowing the command of this awaited Imam, whom they believe exist and is hidden. They have no means of knowing his forbidden or his allowed or even having information about him; they have some transmitted narrations from Rafidah scholars which they are claiming have been conveyed from past Imams from the awaited Imam, in fact they are not conveying anything from the awaited Imam and if anyone of them say he has narrated anything on his authority it is known to be fabrications and lies. If those words (which they claimed to come from the awaited Imam) are enough, then there is no need for the awaited Imam and if it is not enough they have confessed their eternal damnation and perdition, because their success and happiness are hinged upon the directives of the one whose commands they do not know.

I have seen a group of Shia Rafidah scholars like Ibn 'Awd al-Hilli saying: "If those who follow the creed of Imamiyyah differed upon two different opinions and the one who uttered one of the opinions is known while the person who uttered the other opinion is unknown, then the opinion whose source is unknown is the correct one because the awaited Imam is in that group." Consider the gravity of this crass ignorance and misguidance, now even if we assume the existence of the infallible awaited Imam, it would not be known that he made that statement because nobody has conveyed it from him or on the authority of the one who heard it from him. Then, how can you rule that he has said it and that the other opinion can never be his own? Why is the other opinion not his words, since according to them he has hidden himself due to fear of the oppressors and the unjust and thus he cannot be able to openly state his views! Thus, the principle of religion of the Shia Rafidah is based on the unknown and the none existent and not upon the existent and the known. Even if he exist and is infallible they are confessing that they cannot be able to know his commands; what he has allowed and what he forbids, the way they used to know the commands of his parents. What an Imam means is obeying his commands, so if knowing his directives is prohibitive, obeying him will also be impossible; therefore, the desired goal (by his existence) is prohibitive. If the goal (of his existence) is prohibitive, then maintaining a path (with him to Allah) is absolutely not beneficial. Nay, maintaining a path through which the stated goal cannot be attained is a form of irrationality, useless play, foolishness and ugly (self) punishment by the consensus of scholars and by the consensus of those who are intellectually rational, who believe in rational judgment over good and evil. Nay, also by the consensus of all those who have sense, because if they interpreted the ugly to knowing whatever harms they have agreed upon the fact that the harmful can be known intellectually and rationally.

Believe in this Imam is not beneficial but rather harmful to the soul, the intellect, to the body and to properties etc. it is ugly legally and rationally. And that is why those who believe in him are the most far

away people from religious and worldly benefits. Their religious and worldly affairs will never be well arranged and be in order until they enter into obedience of others; like the Jews whose affairs will not be in order until they enter into the obedience others from outside their religious circle!

They are obligating the existence of the awaited infallible Imam because according to them worldly and religious benefits cannot be attained except with him. And with this belief in the awaited Imam they never attain any religious or worldly benefit, and those who disbelieved in him and rejected him did not lose any religious or worldly benefits. Nay, the affairs of those who rejected him are more smoothed and organized and thus, praise be unto Allah.

With this it will be clear that their belief in Imamah cannot bequest anything other than perdition, damnation and regret and there is nothing in it of honor and that if that is the most important principles of religion, then they are the farthest away from the truth and guidance in the most important principles of religion and if it is not the most important principle of religion their claim is thereby nullified. The falsity of their belief has been proven on the basis of any of the two assessments; and that is the aim.

If those Shia Rafidah say: We undoubtedly, with this our belief in the awaited infallible is like the belief of many ascetic scholars and religious men in Elias, Khidr, Gauth, Qutb and men of the unseen whose whereabouts are unknown and their commands and prohibitions are also not known. Then, how can somebody who believes in those people oppose us in our belief? We say, reply to this is from many angles:

Firstly, the belief in those people is not obligatory to all Muslims scholars and their known sects, although some extremists are making belief in their existence obligatory upon their followers, by saying nobody can be a believing friend of Allah until he believe in their existence at this period, but his words are rejected just like the words of Rafidah.

Secondly, among people there are those who believe that believing in those people increases a believer in faith, goodness and bring him

closer to Allah and that the one who believe in those is more complete, more honorable and better in the sight of Allah than those who do not believe in their existence. This statement is not like the statement of Rafidah from all respects, it is only similar to it in some areas because they made the completeness of religion hinged on upon it.

At this junction we say: This statement is also false by the consensus of Muslim scholars and their sages (leaders), for surely knowing the obligations and the recommended actions and carrying out the obligatory duties and the recommended duties are all not hinged upon the belief in the existence of those people and whoever think among the devotees, the ascetics and the masses that something in religion whether obligatory or recommended is hinged upon the existence of those people, then that person is ignorant and misguided by the consensus of those who possess knowledge and faith, who are learned in the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w). This is because it is known necessarily in the religion of Islam that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) did not ordain for his community belief in the existence of those people, and his companions never consider that to be part of religion and neither the leaders of Muslims. All these words (names) such as Gauth, Qutb, Autad, and Nujbaa etc. have never been transmitted to us from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) by anybody with a known (sound) chain of transmitters saying that he has talked about them and neither his companions. With regard to the word (name) Abdal, some of our predecessors have mentioned it and narrated it from the Prophet (s.a.w), but it is weak (fabricated) hadith, [\[20\]](#) we have explained the reality about it in another place (book).

SEGMENT: ACTS OF POLYTHEISM BY SOME ASCETICS EVEN IN ALLAH'S LORDSHIP

Thirdly, it shall be known that among those who believe in those things there are those who are ascribing to them what is forbidden to ascribe to any human being, like the claim of some of them that Gauth or Qutb is the one who is supplying and providing those living on the earth with guidance, aid, and provisions and that all these things cannot reach anybody unless if they come through that person. This is false by the consensus of Muslims and it is like the belief of the Christian in similar case. Some of them also claim that any of those people knew those who love them whether he is in existence or he will exist (in the future); his name, the name of his father and his station with Allah and similar thing of false statements which implied somebody among human beings is associating Allah in some of His characteristics and attributes; such as He knew every thing or He is able to do all things and the like. Some of them are saying some of these words with regard to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and their scholars; that the knowledge of one of them will reach the stage of compatibility with the knowledge of Allah and His Power, thus, he will know what Allah knows and he will be able to do what Allah does. These statements and its like are like the beliefs of the Christians and those who have gone to the extreme (exaggerate) with regard to Imam Ali (r.a), and it is all false by the consensus of Muslims.

Among them there are those who are ascribing to those people what is allowed to be ascribed to Prophets and righteous people of miracles, such as accepted supplication and illuminations like the illuminations of righteous people and the like. These types of things happen so many time times to people who are physically present. Those who are ascribing that to those whose existence is unknown; those people though they have made mistake by ascribing those things to non existent people, there mistake is like the mistake of the one who believe that in such a country there are friends of Allah while in reality there is nobody or he believe that particular people are friends of Allah while they are not so in reality. Undoubtedly, this

is a mistake, ignorance and misguidance in which many people falls, but the mistake of Shia Imamiyyah and their misguidance are greater and uglier.

SEGMENT: ELIAS AND KHIDR DO NOT EXIST

Fourthly, we state that the certainty of competent scholars is that Elias and Khidr^[21] are dead, and that there is nobody among mankind who is an intermediary between Allah the Exalted in His Dominion and his slaves on matters of creation, provision of provisions and sustenance, His aid and guidance for the Prophets are only intermediaries in conveying His message to mankind and nobody can reach happiness and success without giving obedience to them. With regard to His creation, guidance, aid and sustenance, nobody can be able to provide them other than Allah and thus, these are not hinged upon the life of Messengers and their continuous existence. Nay, absolutely aiding Allah's slaves and their sustenance is never hinged upon the existence of Messengers, but Allah provide with whatever means He wishes such as the Angels and others and may be some human beings might be of the means through which Allah by natural traditional means aid His slaves. To state that Allah will never provide to His slaves but by means of some human beings or that somebody among mankind is carrying out all those responsibilities or something of that nature; all these are false opinions. After this, we say to Shia Rafidah; you are only proving misguidance with another misguidance: **“It will profit you not this Day as you did wrong, (and) that you will be sharers in the punishment” (43:39).**

Furthermore, it is well known that it is necessary to mention in the Book of Allah the Exalted the noblest issues of Muslims and the most important necessities in this world more than any other issue, and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) shall have given precedence in explaining it over all other issues. The Qur'an is full of mentioning the Oneness of Allah, His Names and Attributes, His signs, His Angels, His Books, His Messengers, the Last Day, laws of retaliation or revenge, commands, prohibitions, punishments, obligations, and sharing inheritance etc. in contrast to Imamah; then how is it that the Qur'an is not filled with the most important and the noblest principle of religion? Moreover, Allah the Most High has hinged success and happiness upon issues in which Imamah is not mentioned, He said:

“And whoso obeys Allah and the Messenger (Muhammad), then they will be in the company of those on whom Allah has bestowed His Grace, of the Prophets, the Siddiqun (the sincere lovers of truth who follows the Prophets, who were first and foremost to believe in them, like Abu Bakr AsSiddiq), the martyrs, and the righteous. And how excellent these companions are!” (4:69). And He said: **“These are the limits (set by) Allah (or ordainments as regards laws of inheritance), and whosoever obeys Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad) will be admitted to Gardens under which rivers flow (in Paradise), to abide therein, and that will be the great success. And whosoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad), and transgresses His limits, He will cast him into the Fire, to abide therein; and he shall have a disgraceful torment” (4:13-14).** Allah the Exalted has explained that whoever obeyed Him and His Messenger will be successful in the Hereafter, and whoever disobeys Him and His Messenger and transgresses His limits will be punished; this is the differentiation between happiness and damnation; and Imamah has not been mentioned.

If somebody come and say Imamah is included in obeying Allah and His Messenger. Then we will say its extreme degree can be like some obligations such as prayer, Zakat, fasting, and pilgrimage etc. all of which are included in obeying Allah and His Messenger, then how can it alone be the noblest issue of Muslims and the most important religious matters? If it said that there is no way we can obey the Messenger until we obey the Imam because he is the one who knows the laws. We reply that this is the claim of your creed, and there is no evidence to prove it and it is well known that the Qur'an did not mention this the way it mentioned all the principles of religion. We have already explained that this Imam (awaited Mahdi) that you are claiming; nobody has benefitted from him in that regard. And we will explain latter – by the Will of Allah – that what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) brought does not need the aid of any Imam (the way Shia are claiming it) in order to know it (or understand it).

SEGMENT: PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION ACCORDING TO SHIA IMAMIYYAH RAFIDAH

Second approach: It is said that the principles of religion according to Shia Rafidah beliefs are four; Oneness of Allah, justice, Prophethood and Imamah which is the last in the grading. Since Oneness of Allah, justice and Prophethood has preceded it (Imamah) and they included in Oneness of Allah negation of His attributes, that the Qur'an is created, and that Allah cannot be seen in the Hereafter. They are including in justice rejection of Qadr and that Allah cannot be able to guide whom He Wish and He cannot be able to misguide whoever He Wishes and that He may Wish what will not occur and will occur what He did not Wish and other similar beliefs. They do not believe that He created all things and that He is able to do all things. They do not believe that whatever Allah Wishes will occur and that what He did not Wish will not occur. And to them Oneness of Allah (Tawhid), justice and Prophethood are forwarded before Imamah! Then how can it be the noblest and the most important (principle of religion)? Again they make Imamah necessary because it is a grace among obligations, therefore it is obligatory as a means for attaining a goal; then how can a means be the noblest and most important than the objective?

SEGMENT: SHIA RAFIDAH'S CONTRADICTIONS IN WORDS AND APPLICATIONS

The third approach: We say if Imamah is the most important principle of religion and the noblest issue of the Muslims then the people who are the farthest away from this most important principle and the noblest issue are the Shia Rafidah. This is because they have made the most foolish statement, that destroys both the intellect and religion with regard to Imamah as we will explain that – by the Will of Allah – when we come to discuss their evidences.

For now, it is enough for you to know their goal for Imamah is that they shall have an infallible Imam who will be a grace in their religious and worldly affairs and among all sects they are the farthest away from the benefits of grace and Imamah, for they are following the unknown and the non-existent (twelfth Imam), who cannot be seen and cannot be traced, his motion is never detected nor any news about him can be obtained; therefore the intended goal for his being an Imam (leader) has not been attained by them. Any person who is appointed as an Imam (leader) in some beneficial religious and worldly affairs is better than the one from who no benefit is gained by his Imamah (leadership).

Due to the fact that they have lost the benefits of Imamah, you will find them obeying unbelievers and oppressors so that they can gain it (through such obedience) some of their goals. So, at the time when they are inviting people to enter into obedience of infallible Imam you find them obeying unbeliever and oppressor. Is there anybody who is more far away from the aim of Imamah and from goodness, grace and honor, than the one who follows the way to regret? Summarily, Allah the Exalted has hinged upon those in authority some religious and worldly benefits, whether Imamah is most important issue or not and Rafidah are the farthest away from attaining those benefits for they have lost, - according to their statements - the intended goodness from the most important principle of religion and the noblest issue of the Muslims.

One of the Shia Rafidah scholars met me and asked me to isolate with him so that we debate together. I secluded with him and lay down what they are saying with regard to this issue as follows: "Surely Allah has commanded His slaves and forbids them; therefore it is incumbent upon Him to provide grace for them which will aid them to be closer to carrying out obligations and shunning the ugly things. This is because whoever invites another person to come and eat food, then it is incumbent upon him to help him with means that will make him eat, like welcoming him and making him sits in a suitable place and so forth. If he does not want him to eat he will frown on his face and shut his door etc." They copy these types of argumentations from the Mu'atazilites, for it is not part of the principles of their earliest scholars.

And then they (Shia Rafidah) say: "Surely Allah has commanded His slaves and regulated them; and thus it is incumbent upon Him to provide for them grace, and Imamah is grace, because if people have an Imam who is directing them to carry out obligations and forbidding them from committing abominations they would be closer to carrying out directives. Therefore, it is necessary for them to have an Imam and he must be infallible so that the goal (of appointing him) will be attained. Since nobody has been pointed to as an infallible person after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) other than Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a), this entailed that he is the one; this is because there is a consensus that other than him are not infallible." And then they say: "Ali has appointed Hasan and Hasan has appointed Husain onward until the appointment terminated with Muhammad bin Hasan al-Askari the awaited, absent, Mahdi the companion of cave."

The Rafidi confessed that this is a good stipulation of their creed in an absolute complete form. I then said to him: You and I are seeking for knowledge, the truth and guidance. Now, they (Shia) are saying that whoever does not believe in the awaited, absent Imam is an unbeliever! Then, this awaited absent Imam, have you seen him, or saw anybody who has seen him or heard any information with regard to him or did you know any of his words which he has uttered or what he has commanded or what he has forbidden which has been

taken from him the way knowledge is received from scholars? He replied: No. I said: then what is the benefit of our belief in this? What grace have we acquired or are getting through him? How can Allah, the Exalted the Wise command us to obey a person that we do not know what he is commanding us to do or to abstain from and we do not have any means of knowing that absolutely? And they (Shia) are the greatest people who reject "obligation of what is prohibitive." Then, what obligation of what is prohibitive more extreme than this?

He said: Proving this is based on those premises (the above mentioned Shia arguments). I said: What is required from it is what is of concern to us, otherwise what is our concern with what has passed if it is not related to us with regard to commands and prohibitions? If our words on those premises do not bring to us any benefit or grace then it is discerned and deduced that the belief in the awaited, absent Imam is from the direction of ignorance and not the direction of benefits and grace. What Shia Imamiyyah possessed of texts from his past parents; if it is true that they will lead to happiness (felicity) and success, then there is no need for the awaited, absent Mahdi and if it will not lead to success and happiness; then what have they benefitted from the awaited Mahdi? In another consideration what the past dead Imams have bequeathed of texts (and knowledge), if they are true and they will attain with it success, then they do not need the awaited Imam and if it is false they also did not benefit from the awaited Imam and thus, they neither benefitted from the awaited Imam in knowing the truth and neither in rejecting falsehood. He never commands the doing of good or forbids committing of evil, and none of them has attained from him any benefit or grace and the benefits that are expected from Imamah (leadership).

Those ignorant people are hinging there affairs on the unknown like Rijalul Ghaith or Qutb or Gauth and Khidr and similar things, although they are displaying their ignorance and misguidance and the fact that they are believing in what they never get any benefit or grace or profit from, neither in religion nor in their worldly affairs, but

yet they are less astray than the Rafidah, this is because people benefits from Khidr by seeing him and by hearing his admonishments, although he has erred in his belief that the person he has seen is Khidr. One of them will see a Jinni and think that he is Khidr, and the Jinni will only speak to him with what he thinks he will accept from him, so that they will have a type of relationship and it will be like it emanated from the man and not the one who is spoken to. Among them there are those who are saying for each period there is a Khidr and among them there are those who believed that each mystic scholar has a Khidr.

Some unbelievers such as the Jews believed that there are particular places in which Khidr can be found, he might be seen in different forms or even in huge forms, this is because the one that is claiming to be Khidr is a Jinni, nay he is Satan; he appears to those who he think he can be able to misguide; and in this issue there are a lot of stories that need not to be mentioned here. On all estimations the sects of Shia are more misguided than those people, because they haven't got any sound knowledge from the awaited Imam and they do not believe that those that they are seeing are his person. He was a small boy when he entered the cave (according to their belief); he has not yet reached the age of discretion (puberty); and they are accepting liars doubled and multiplied more that those people accepts, they reject following the Book and the Sunnah^[22] more than those people and they shows enmity and disparagements against the best of the Muslims while those people oppose them in it. Thus, they are astray from the benefits of Imamah more that all the sects of the Islamic community; they have lost by their statements (beliefs) the best religion and the most honorable principle of religion.

SEGMENT: JUST KNOWING AN IMAM WILL NOT PROVIDE ANY BENEFIT TO ANYONE IF HE DIDN'T WORK RIGHTEOUSNESS

The fourth approach: His statement that by knowing the Imam of the time one will acquire the station of honor is a false statement. Surely, the mere seeing of the Imam of his time in person does not offer honor if he did not follow his commands in the allowed and the forbidden, if not, then knowing the Imam of his time is not better than knowing the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); and whoever knew the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); and he did not believe in him and he did not follow his commands; he never attain any honor. If he believes in the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) but he disobeyed him; he failed to perform the obligations and exceed the limits (of Allah) he deserved punishment according to Imamiyyah and all sects of the Muslims; then how about the one who knew the Imam but he neglected the obligations and has exceeded the limits (of Allah)? And most of those people (Shia Rafidah) believed that: "Love of Ali bin Abi Talib is a goodness that will not be affected by bad deeds."^[23] If committing evils do not harm whoever loves Ali (r.a), then there is no need for any other infallible Imam, who according to Shia is a grace on obligations (commands on do and do not) for if he does not exist there will be evils and ugly deeds; so if love of Ali (r.a) is enough, then it is all the same whether there is an Imam or there isn't any Imam.

SEGMENT: IMAMAH IS NOT ONE OF THE RELIGIOUS OBLIGATIONS

The fifth approach: His words that: “Imamah is one of the principles of faith by which some people will deserve (those who rejected it) eternal damnation in Hell Fire.” We reply that: Who make this as a principle of religion but the ignorant and liars? We will talk about – by the Will of Allah – what he has mentioned of that issue.

Allah the exalted has described the believers and their characteristics and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has explained what is meant by faith and expounded its branches; and Allah and His Messenger never mentioned Imamah. In a sound hadith, the hadith of Gabriel when he came to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in the form of a desert Arab; he asked him concerning Islam, faith and Ihsan (perfection). He replied him saying: **“Islam is to worship Allah Alone and none else, to offer prayers perfectly to pay the compulsory charity (Zakat) and to observe fasts during the month of Ramadan and perform the pilgrimage to the House (of Allah).”** He said concerning faith: **“Is to believe in Allah, His angels, (the) meeting with Him, His Apostles, His Books, to believe in Resurrection and to believe in Qadr its good and its evil.”** And He never mentioned Imamah. He said concerning perfection: **“To worship Allah as if you see Him, and if you cannot achieve this state of devotion then you must consider that He is looking at you.” (Bukhari and Muslim.)** There is consensus that this hadith is sound, accepted by all and all the scholars of hadith sciences have agreed that it is sound. It has been narrated in the books of sound hadith in another version; it is agreed upon among the hadiths of Abu Hurairah (r.a) in the book of Muslim from among the narration of Abdullah bin Umar (r.a). Even though Shia Rafidah do not believe in the soundness of these hadiths; but this Rafidi has forwarded as evidences fabricated hadiths by the consensus of men of knowledge.

If they bring forth a hadith then we must compare their narration with our narration and then rely on what has been proven as evidence

and we will explain what they are forwarding to Ahlus Sunnah (of narrations as proof to their beliefs) of false narrations and then we will indicate the proofs that showed that their narrations are false and fabricated and we will show the soundness of what has been conveyed by those with the knowledge of sciences of hadith and verified it as sound.

Let us assume that we are not substantiating with hadith (or that we do not need it). Allah the Exalted has said: **“The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, feel a fear in their hearts and when His Verses (this Quran) are recited unto them, they (i.e. the Verses) increase their Faith; and they put their trust in their Lord (Alone); Who perform prayer and spend out of that We have provided them. It is they who are the believers in truth; for them are grades of dignity with their Lord, and Forgiveness and a generous provision (Paradise)” (8:2-4).** Here Allah gave witness that those people are believers without mentioning Imamah. And He said: **“Only those are the believers who have believed in Allah and His Messenger, and afterward doubt not but strive with their wealth and their lives for the Cause of Allah. Those; certainly are the truthful” (49:15).** Here Allah has made those people truthful in their faith without mentioning Imamah.

Furthermore, we knew necessarily from the religion of Muhammad (s.a.w) that when people embraced Islam their faith is never hinged upon knowing Imamah and nothing is mentioned to them with regard to it. Whatever is part of faith must be explained by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to the believers and if we knew out of necessity that this has never been among what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is placing as a condition of faith, we are certain that making it conditional is an assertion of liars.

If it is said that it has been implied in the general texts or it is part of what an obligation cannot be carried out except with it or has been explained by another text. We say: If all these statements are sound the utmost limit of what it indicated is that it is just part of a branch of religion and not of the principles of faith, because the principles of faith upon which nobody can be a believer without it is like the two

phrases of witnessing to faith. So, nobody can be a believer until he accepted that there is nobody worthy of being worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is His Messenger (s.a.w). If to say that Imamah is a principle of faith by which nobody can be a believer without it, it would have been incumbent upon the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to explain it, both generally and explicitly to people, an explanation that will cut off any excuse, in the same manner that he has explained the two phrases of witnessing to faith, belief in the Angels, the books, the Messengers and the Last Day. Thus, how can that be true while we have seen that those who entered into his religion in crowds, groups and parties, he absolutely did not make belief in Imamah conditional upon anyone of them; either generally or specifically.

The sixth approach: With regard to his (the Shia scholar) words that the Messenger of Allah said; “Whoever died without knowing the Imam of his time died the death of ignorance.” We say to him: Who narrated this hadith with these wordings? Where is its chain of authorities (narrators)? How is it possible to provide evidence with a quotation from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) without explaining the technique that will prove that the Prophet (s.a.w) said it? This is if the hadith’s condition is unknown to the scholars of sciences of hadith, then how about this hadith that is absolutely unknown with these wordings. Surely, the known hadith is like the one that has been recorded in Muslim in his sound book of hadith on the authority of Nafi’i who said: “Abdullah bin Umar (r.a) went to Abdullah bin Mute’e during the incidence of al-Harra^[24] at the time of Yazid bin Mu’awiyyah and he (Abdullah bin Mute’e) spread a pillow for Abu Abdurrahman (Ibn Umar). He replied him saying; I did not come to in order to sit, I come to inform you a hadith that I heard from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), I heard him say: ***‘One who withdraws his oath from obedience (to the Amir) will find no argument (in his defense) when he stands before Allah on the Day of Judgment, and one who dies without having bound himself by an oath of allegiance (to an Amir) will die the death of one belonging to the days of ignorance.’***” This hadith was stated by

Abdullah bin Umar to Abdullah bin Mute'e bin al-Aswad when they withdrew the oath of allegiance they gave to the ruler of their time Yazid, although he has some misdeeds, and then he fought with them and did with the people of Harra objectionable deeds. Thus we knew that this hadith is teaching what the hadiths that we will mentioned latter are teaching; which is people shall not rebel against Muslims leaders with the sword (gun), and if a person is not rendering obedience to those in authority he dies the death of ignorance.

This is contrary to the belief of Rafidah for they are the greatest people that oppose those in authority and the farthest people from rendering them obedience except if forced. We are demanding from them: Firstly, authenticity of what they have quoted (as hadith). Secondly, if we assume that it was reported by one person; then how can we affirm a principle of faith with this kind of hadith, whose narrator is unknown and even if he is known we can be able to show his mistake or his lies; can a principle of faith be known other than by the scientific method?

The seventh approach: We say if this hadith has been uttered by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), there is no proof in it for this man, because the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: "He died the death of ignorance." Now this hadith implied all those who fight for partisanship, and the Rafidah are the principal actors and leaders (of those fighting for the sake of partisanship). Those who fight for the sake of partisanship cannot be declared as unbelievers as has been explained by the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w), then how can he be excommunicated with what is lesser than that. In Sahih Muslim, on the authority of Abu Hurairah who said that the Messenger of Allah said: ***"Whoever renounced obedience (to a leader) and withdrew from the community, then he died, he has died a death of ignorance."*** And Sahihain (Bukhari and Muslim), on the authority of Abdullah bin Abbas, who said the Messenger of Allah said: ***"Whoever saw from his leader what he detest shall be patient, for whoever rebelled against the ruler by hand span, he has died a death of ignorance."***

Despite the facts that all the above texts are very clear on the conditions of Shia Rafidah they (and other known hadiths) are not known in the wordings of Rafidah (hadith as cited above) by all scholars of hadith sciences.

The eighth approach: The hadith he quoted is a proof against Rafidah because they do not know the Imam of their time. They are claiming that their Imam is the disappeared, awaited, Imam Muhammad bin Hasan, who has entered into a cave (or a subterranean vault) in Samarra in the year 260AH or something like that and he never come back and at that time his age is either two years or three or five or something of that nature. He has now according to their statement over four hundred years,^[25] he is never seen and not a trace of him is found, his motion cannot be detected and neither any information about him is obtained. Nobody know him among them either in person or by description, but they are saying that a person that has not been seen by anybody and there is no any information about him, is the Imam of their time. And it is well known that this is not how to know an Imam. The similitude of this is that a person has a relative, a paternal uncle in this world and he did not know anything about him, then this person did not know his paternal uncle, likewise a founded wealth (i.e. on the road side), it is known that it has an owner, but that particular person is not known.

With regard to the awaited Imam, nothing is known about him that can be beneficial in leadership and authority. This is because the knowledge of an Imam which will remove a person from ignorance is the knowledge that will led to obedience and community in contrast to the condition of people of ignorance, because they do not have a leader who they rally around him and neither a community that protect them. Allah the Exalted sent Muhammad (s.a.w) and guided them to obedience and the community, and this awaited Imam you can't acquire with knowing him any obedience and neither a community; he is not known with certainty that remove man from ignorance, nay those who ascribing themselves to him are the greatest parties that are covered by ignorance. This will be explained.

The ninth approach: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has commanded obedience to leaders that are present, who are known and who have authority with which they run the affairs of people and not obeying the none existent and neither the unknown and absolutely not the one who has no power or authority and neither does he possess the ability to do anything. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) also commanded community and unity and forbids disunity and division; he did not command unrestricted obedience to leaders, but he instructed that they have a duty to be obeyed in obedience to Allah and not in disobedience to Him. This explained and showed that the leaders (Imams) that he commanded to be obeyed are not infallible.

If he (the Shia Rafidah scholar) mean by saying that it is the most important principle in religion and the noblest affair of the Muslims upon which the Islamic community disagreed after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); and it is the question of Imamah. We replied to him saying: Your statement is neither eloquent nor it's meaning sound, because what you have mentioned does not indicate to this meaning; nay what is understood from the words and what they entailed is that it is absolutely the most important principles of religion and absolutely the most honorable matter of the Muslims.

If we assume that this is what you want to say, then this meaning is false, because Muslims differed after the Messenger of Allah on issues more noble than this one. And if it is assumed that this is the noblest issues. Then, what you have mentioned is the most incorrect creed and the most corrupt principle; this is because conflict over leadership (Imamah) did not occur but during the Caliphate of Imam Ali (r.a). During the Caliphate of the first three Caliphs conflict never occurred other than what happened on the day of Saqifa and they never left the place until after they have agreed; this type of issue cannot be considered a conflict. If we assume that conflict concerning it is after the death of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), then it shall be known that not everything upon which there is conflict immediately after his death is more honorable than what has been differed upon after long period of his death. If that is the case then

the issues of Oneness of Allah, His attributes, Ithbat (affirming the characteristics whereby He described Himself in His Book and through His Prophet)), at-Tanzih ('declaring incomparability', i.e. affirming Allah's transcendent distance from humanity) , destiny, justice, al-tahsin (literally "declaring (something) to be good)," al-taqbih (literally "declaring (something) to be evil," and al-Tajweez (declaring something to be possible) are more important and noblest than the issue of Imamah. And the questions of the Perfect names of Allah, laws, promise and warnings, intercession and eternal damnation in Hell fire are more important than the issue of Imamah. If Imamah is the most important religious issue, then they have lost of the religious issues the most important and the noblest part of it and therefore, they will not benefit from what they believe of Tauhid (Oneness of Allah) and Divine Justice because they will be deficient with regard to the requirements of Imamah and thus, they deserved punishment.

Why not since they are acknowledging that the requirement of Imamah is in branches of religious laws while with regard to intellectual principles there is no need for an Imam, and that is the most important and the noblest!!! After all these your statements on Imamah is farther away from being the right one; if there is nothing of defect in it other than that you have made it of the obligatory principles of religion due to its benefits to human beings in their religious and worldly affairs and your Imam of the time; you do not get any benefit from his direction; neither in religion nor in worldly affairs.

Whose efforts is more wasted that the efforts of the one who has been suffering for a long time, saying this and that (too much propaganda), dismembered himself from the Muslim community, curse and disparage the first to embrace Islam and those who followed them in goodness, he is helping unbeliever and hypocrites (over Muslims and Islam), he plan all forms of beguilements and deceptions, he follows all forms of ways that are possible for him (against Muslims), he employ false witnesses, he misled his followers with ropes of deceptions and do many other things and his

goal for doing all that is that he shall have an Imam who will guide him to the commands of Allah and His prohibitions, and to teach him what will take him nearer to Allah the Exalted. Then, after he knew the name of that Imam and his lineage he never attain his goal and he never attain anything of his teaching and guidance, neither his commands nor his prohibitions and he did not get from him any benefit; there is no any advantage absolutely, except suffering himself, wasting his wealth, wasted travels, waiting for long days and nights, and generally showing hatred to Muslims all these for the sake of the one who has hidden himself in a subterranean vault or a cave; who has no undertaking and no statement.

If he really exist those poor men will not attain any benefit from him. How can that be while those with intellects knew that they have nothing other than bankruptcy because Hasan bin Ali al-Askari did not have a child and never have any offspring as was mentioned by Muhammad bin Jarir at-Tabari, Abdul Baqi bin Qan'i and other scholars of the science genealogy. They (Shia rafidah) are saying that he entered a subterranean vault after the death of his farther and at that time his age is either two years, or three or five and something of that nature; this type of person according to the Qur'an is an orphan whose property shall be kept by somebody until he reach the age of sound judgment, he will be taken care by the person who deserves to take care of him among his near kindred and if he reach seven years he will be commanded to purify himself ritually and pray. The person who do not perform ritual purity and he does not pray, and he himself and his property are under the care of his guardian by command of the Qur'an, even if he exist physically he does not deserve to be the Imam of the believers; then how about if he does not exist or he is lost with all this long absence? Now if a guardian of a woman is absent the ruler or the existing guardian will give her hand in marriage; so that the benefits of Imamah will not be lost with this long period of absence.

SEGMENT: SHIA RAFIDAH ON LEADERSHIP AND AUTHORITY AFTER THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH – SUCCESSORSHIP (IMAMAH)

The Rafidi stated: When Allah sent Muhammad (s.a.w), he conveyed the Message and he appointed Ali bin Abi Talib as his successor after him, then after him his son al-Hasan an-Naqi (the pure), then after him Husain the martyr, then Ali bin Husain Zainul Abideen, then Muhammad bin Ali al-Baqir, then Ja'afar bin Muhammad as-Sadiq, then Musa bin Muhammad al-Khazim, then Ali bin Musa al-Rida, then Muhammad bin Ali al-Jawwad, then Ali bin Muhammad al-Hadi, then Hasan bin Ali al-Askari, and then the proof Muhammad bin al-Hasan al-Mahdi and that the Messenger of Allah did not die until after he has made will concerning Imamah. But Ahlus Sunnah has opposed all these (directives).

SEGMENT: GROUPS AMONG AHLUS SUNNAH AND OTHER SECTS ON IMAMAH AND CALIPHATE

With regard to his statement concerning Ahlus Sunnah that they are saying that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) did not appoint anybody (to succeed him) and that he died without making a will (for his successorship).

We say: Reply to the above allegation is that, this is not the opinion of all of them because groups of Ahlus Sunnah believed that the Imamah of Abubakar was established and proven with clear explicit text and the disagreement (difference of opinion) on that issue is well known in the school of thought of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal and others from among the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah. Al-Qadi Abu Ya'ali and others have mentioned that there are two opinions from Imam Ahmad one of which is that the Caliphate of Abubakar was established textually by narrations (hadiths), he stated that this is the opinion of many of the scholars of the science of hadith, the Mua'atazilites and the Ash'ariyyah^[26] and this is the favored opinion of al-Qadi Abu Ya'ali and others.

The second opinion is that it was established and proven by a latent texts and signs; he stated that this is the opinion of al-Hasan al-Basri and a group of among the scholars of hadith, Bakr bin 'Ukt al-Wahidi and al-Baihasiyyah among the Khawarij^[27]

Our Sheikh Abu Abdullah bin Hamid stated that: Our proof that Abubakar (r.a) deserved the Caliphate more than any other person from the family of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his companions (r.a) are deduced from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w). He said: Our companions have differed concerning the Caliphate; was it established by texts or by signs, some of them opined that it was proven by texts and that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) mentioned that textually and among our companions there are those who said it was proven by explicit texts.

Abu Hamid stated that: And the evidence of establishing the Caliphate of Abubakar by text are the hadiths narrations among which are the one that was recorded by Bukhari on the authority of

Jabir bin Mut'im (r.a) who said: ***"A woman come to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and he asked her to come back to him (at another time). She said: How about if I come back and didn't find you - as she means death -; He replied: If you didn't find me then meet Abubakar."*** He mentioned other versions of the hadith and other hadiths and then said: And this is a text on his leadership.

He said: And the hadith of Sufyan on the authority of Abdullah bin 'Umair, from Rabi'i, on the authority of Huzaifah bin Yaman who said the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***"You shall follow the footsteps of those people after me; Abubakar and Umar"*** (Ahmad and Tirmidhi).

In another hadith it was narrated by Abu Huraira: Allah's Apostle said, ***"While I was sleeping, I saw myself standing at a well over which there was a bucket. I pulled out from it as many buckets of water as Allah wished, and then Ibn Abi Quhafa (Abu Bakr) took the bucket from me and pulled out one or two full buckets, and there was weakness in his pull--may Allah forgive him. Then the bucket turned into a very large one and 'Umar bin Al-Khattab took it. I have never seen any strong man among the people, drawing water with such strength as 'Umar did, till the people (drank to their satisfaction and) watered their camels to their fill; whereupon the camels sat beside the water"*** (Bukhari). He said and this is a text on Imamah.

He said and that is proven by the hadith we were informed with by Abubakar bin Malik and which appeared in Musnad of Imam Ahmad on the authority of Abu Bakarah, on the authority of his farther who said: ***The Messenger of Allah one day asked: Who among you had a dream? I said; Me. O Messenger of Allah, I saw as if a scale was brought down from the sky and you were weighed with Abubakar and overweighed him, then Abubakar was weighed with Umar and he overweighed Umar, then Umar was weighed with Uthman and he overweighed Uthman, after that the scale was taken up. The Apostle of Allah said: Successorship to Prophethood and after that Allah will give authority to whomever He Wish"*** (Ahmad).

On the authority of Jabir bin Abdullah (r.a) who said: ***The Messenger of Allah said: In the past night a pious (slave of Allah) saw (in a dream) Abubakar attached to the Messenger of Allah, Umar was attached to Abubakar and Uthman was attached to Umar. Jabir bin Abdullah said: When we left the presence of the Messenger of Allah we said (in interpretation to the dream) as for phrase “the pious person.” It means the Messenger of Allah and as for those who are attached to him and to each other; they are those who will be leaders (successors) of this affair which Allah sent with his Messenger (Abu Dawud).***

Among the proofs is the hadith of Saleh bin Kisan, from Zuhri, from 'Urwah on the authority of Aisha (s.a.w) who said: ***“I entered before the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) on the day he started feeling sick. He said: ‘Call me your farther and your brother, so that I will write for Abubakar a statement.’ Then he said: ‘Allah and the believers will not agree but on Abubakar.’ In another version is added the phrase: ‘So that nobody will covet this affair’” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

Another proof is the hadith on the authority of Aisha (r.a) who said: ***“When sickness overwhelmed the Messenger of Allah, he said: ‘Call for me Abdurrahman bin Abubakar, so that I write for Abubakar a statement which none will dispute.’ Then he said: ‘Allah forbids that the believers will disagree on Abubakar’” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** He also mentioned the hadiths of forwarding him to lead prayer and other hadiths that I did not mention because scholars of hadith do not accept them.

Abu Muhammad bin Hazm in his book al-Milal wal-Nihal said: “People differed on Imamah after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), a group said; the Messenger of Allah did not appoint anybody. Thereafter, they differed again and a group among them says; but since he has forwarded Abubakar to lead prayer, that proved that he more deserved to be the leader and the man with authority after him for that directive. Another group said: No it is because his virtues are more established and that is why they selected and choose him to

lead them. Yet another group says; the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has appointed Abubakar to be the leader after him with clear, explicit, unambiguous text.” Abu Muhammad bin Hamz further stated: “And this is our belief for reasons one of which is: The consensus and agreement of all people whom Allah said concerning them; **‘(And there is also a share in this booty) for the poor emigrants (Muhajirun), who were expelled from their homes and their property, seeking Bounties from Allah and to please Him: And helping Allah (i.e. helping His religion) and His Messenger; Such are indeed the truthful (to what they say)’ (59:8).** Undoubtedly, those who Allah gave witness concerning them as ‘the truthful’ (thus bearing witness to their sincerity and truthfulness) and all their brothers among the Ansar have agreed upon giving him the title ‘Successor to the Messenger of Allah.’ This is because the meaning of Khalifah (successor) in Arabic language is the one who another person appointed to succeed him and not the one who succeeded him without being appointed by him. Other than this is not accepted in the Arabic language with no disagreement.”

He (Ibn Hazm) further stated: It is impossible for them to mean with that (calling him successor of the Messenger of Allah) his being advanced to lead people in prayer for two necessary reasons:

Firstly, Abubakar never deserved this title while the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is alive for at that time he is only his successor (representative) in leading prayer and therefore, we are soundly sure that the title given to him (The Successor of the Messenger of Allah) is not meant by his being advanced to lead prayer.

Secondly, all the people that the Messenger of Allah appointed to positions of authority during his life such as Ali (over Madina in the battle of Tabuk), Ibn Umm al-Makhtoum (over Madina in the battle of al-Khandaq), Uthman bin Affan (over Madina in the battle of Dhat-Riq’a) and all those who have been appointed over some countries such as Yemen, Bahrain, Ta’if and other places; none of them deserved to be called – without any disagreement between all scholars – The Successor of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Therefore without any ambiguity we are sure that they meant by that

(title) succeeding the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) after his death over his community. And it is impossible for them to agree over it if he did not appoint him explicitly; if there is nothing of evidence in this regard other than commanding him to lead people in prayer in his stead, then he wouldn't be more deserving to be called with the title "Successor of the Messenger of Allah" over all those mentioned people (who he appointed to undertake some responsibilities during his life time). In addition to the above there is a sound hadith in which a woman said to the Messenger of Allah; ***"how about if I come back and didn't meet you – as if she means death. He replied he saying: Then go and meet Abubakar."*** (Ibn Hazm said) and this is an explicit text with regard to the successorship of Abubakar. He added that there is a sound hadith on the authority of Aisha that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said to her while he is on his sick bed: ***"I have desired to invite your father and your brother so that I write a statement and make a will so that somebody will not say I more deserved it or somebody will covet it; but Allah, His Messenger and the believers will not agree but on Abubakar"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). Another version of the hadith come with phrase: ***"And Allah and believers will not agree but on Abubakar."*** (Ibn Hazm said) and this is another explicit clear text that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has appointed Abubakar to be his successor.^[28]

If those who believe that the Messenger of Allah did not appoint anybody prove their statement with the narration of Abdullah bin Umar on the authority of Umar bin Khattab where he said (when he was asked to appoint a successor while he is on his death bed): ***"Allah will doubtlessly protect His religion. If I do not nominate a successor (I have a precedent before me), for the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) did not nominate his successor. And if I nominate one (I have a precedent), for Abu Bakr did nominate. The narrator (Ibn Umar) said: By God. when he mentioned the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and Abubakar, I (at once) understood that he would not place anyone at a par with the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) and would not nominate***

anyone” (Muslim). And with what has been narrated on the authority of Aisha when she was asked: **“Who do you think the Messenger of Allah will appoint if he is to appoint a successor?” (Muslim).**

(Ibn Hazm said) it is impossible that the above narrations contradict the consensus of the Prophet’s companions (r.a) and the hadiths that have been cited are sound words of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) while the above two statements stopped at Umar and Aisha, and there statement cannot be upheld over that of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). The fact is that those texts did not reach Umar (r.a) just like other texts that did not reach him; such as the text of seeking permission and others or he meant appointment with a written will; we are confessing that his appointment was not with a written document. The same reply could be given to the reply of Aisha (r.a); there words were uttered due to the questions of questioners, but proof is in there narrations and not in their words.

I (Ibn Taimiyyah) say: Explanations with regard to the Caliphate of Abubakar and others has been made in details in other places (in this book). Our aim here is to explain what people said with regard to his Caliphate; has it been established by a clear explicit text or by suggestive un-explicit texts, was it established by that or by his being chosen by those with influence; who can bind and unbind? We have shown that a lot of the predecessor and those who come after them have said that his appointment is by clear texts and others said it is by latent texts (indications and encouragement). Therefore, the statement of Shia Rafida that “Ahlus Sunnah are saying that the Messenger of Allah did not appoint anybody to succeed him and that he died without making a will” is false and untruth. It shall also be noted that this is not the opinion of all of them, so if the truth is contrary to it, some of them are holding that opinion. On the basis of the two assumptions the truth is still within the Ahlus Sunnah. Furthermore, if we assume that the truth is with those who are holding to textual evidence; that will not be an evidence for Shia Rafidah because Shia Rawandiyyah^[29] are claiming text for Abbas

(uncle of the Messenger of Allah) the way they are claiming text for Ali bin Abi Talib.

Al-Qadi Abu Ya'ali and other scholars said: Shia Rawandiyyah differed (with Rafidah) and some of them believe that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has particularly appointed Abbas to succeed him and he openly announced the appointment publically and that the Islamic community rejected that appointment and thereby they have apostate from Islam. They further stated that: The Muslims have gone against the command of the Messenger of Allah out of arrogance. There are among them who are saying that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has appointed Abbas and his progeny up to the Last Day by latent texts and not an explicit one. Those two opinions of Rawundiyyah are like the two opinions of Shia, because Imamiyyah is saying that Imam Ali has been appointed by open declaration and mentioning by stating: This is the Imam after me, therefore listen to him and obey him, while Shia Zaidiyyah (which is also an Imamiyyah sect) are contradicting them on that issue.

Among the Shia Zaidiyyah there are those who are saying the Prophet appointed him by texts through his saying: ***“Whomsoever beloved friend I am, Ali also is his beloved friend.”*** And his saying: ***“You are unto me as Aaron was to Moses.”*** In addition to other latent texts that cannot be understood without pondering over them very well. It was narrated from Shia Jarudiyyah of the Zaidiyyah sect their saying that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) appointed Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a) through pointing to a characteristic that only he (Ali) possess it and not by naming him. Thus, the claims of Rawundiyyah to texts are just like the claims of Shia Rafidah. Shia Imamiyyah has other opinions and claims.

What we are trying to establish here is that the beliefs of Rafidah are contradicted by similar beliefs, because their claim to appointment of Ali is like the claim of those people with regard to the appointment of Abbas and both beliefs are known to be false by necessity. Nobody among the people endowed with knowledge state any of those statements; they were just fabricated by liars as will be explained – by the Will of Allah the Exalted – and that is why nobody among the

religious men and scholars among the children of Ali and Abbas are making those claims in contrast to the appointment of Abubakar by texts which has many proponents from among the scholars.

What is being proven is that many among the Ahlus Sunnah are saying that his (Abubakar) Caliphate was established by texts, they are proving their claims with known sound narrations, and undoubtedly, the opinion of those people is stronger than that of those who are saying the Caliphate of Ali or Abbas is established by texts. This is because they have nothing other than lies and falsehood which falsity is known necessarily by all who have knowledge of the conditions of Islam or with their forwarding proofs that do not prove what they are claiming like the hadiths of appointing Ali over Madina when he (the Prophet) left for Tabuk campaign and similar cases that will explained latter by the will of Allah the Exalted.

It will be said in reply to this Shia Rafidi: If it is incumbent to appoint an Imam by text, then believing in these texts is more appropriate than believing in the ones you cited and if this is not obligatory then your claims are negated. The fact is that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) indicated to the Muslims concerning the Caliphate of Abubakar and guided them to it through many methods; by words and actions; he informed about his Caliphate and shows that he is pleased with it; he recommended it and desire to write a document concerning it and then he dropped his desire because he knew that Muslims will agree upon it and thus he is satisfied (with his fore knowledge). The Messenger of Allah (sw.a.w) again desired to write a document (with regard to the Caliphate of Abubakar), while he is sick on Thursday and when some of them fall into doubt; is what he is saying due to intensity of sickness or they are words that shall be obeyed? He therefore, abandoned the writing because of his fore knowledge that Allah will chose him and so also the believers; if he know choosing him will be doubtful to them he will have explained it to them in such away that will leave no excuse to its clarity; but since he has indicated the choice of Abubakar to them by many signs they also understood his indications and the goal was achieved.

That is why when Umar bin Khattab gave a sermon before the Muhajirun and Ansar he said: ***“There there is none among you who has the qualities of Abubakar” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** He also said on the day of Saqifa with regard to Abubakar before the Muhajirun and Ansar: ***“We would rather pledge our allegiance to you. You are our master, the best of us and the most beloved to the Messenger (saw) out of all of us.”(Bukhari),*** and nobody among those present denied that, nobody among the Muhajirun states that other than Abubakar more deserved the Caliphate than him and nobody contend the Caliphate but few from the Ansar who wished that there shall be a leader from them and a leader from the Muhajirun; and this type of affair (disunity) has been forbidden by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in sound hadith.

Thereafter all the Ansar gave vow of allegiance except Sa’ad bin ‘Ubadah because he is the one who has been seeking leadership and authority. Nobody among the Prophet companions ever said that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has appointed other than Abubakar; neither Abbas bin Abdulmutallib nor Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a) and nay nobody other than those two. Abbas and Ali (r.a) never – and nobody among those who love them – claimed the Caliphate to anyone of them or that they have been appointed by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to be Caliphs after him. Nay, and nobody among the Prophet’s companions states that among the Quraish tribe there is any person that deserved it more than Abubakar and neither from Banu Hashim nor from other than Banu Hashim. All these matters are known by well versed scholars in hadith, Sunnah and history; it is known to them out of necessity (in the religion of Islam).^[30]

The Caliphate of Abubakar was indicated in sound traditions; its establishment and that Allah and His Messenger are pleased with it; ^[31] it was established by Muslims, after choosing him and giving the vow of allegiance to him; they choose him because they rely on their knowledge of the fact that Allah and His Messenger preferred him and that he more deserved it in the estimation of Allah and His Messenger. Therefore, it was established by both texts and consensus of the Muslims but the texts indicated that Allah and His

Messenger (s.a.w) are pleased with it and that he more deserved it; that Allah has decreed it and willed it and that believers will choose it and this is more lasting and graver than making will concerning it because in that case the method of sanctioning it is only a will. If Muslims choose him without a will, texts have indicated that what they have done is the right thing and that Allah and His Messenger are pleased with that; these showed as-Siddiq has many virtues with which he is differentiated from other people and which made Muslims to determine that he deserved the Caliphate more than them. This type of person did not require a special nomination by will just as the Messenger of Allah said to Aisha when he wanted to write a will for Abubakar: ***“Call for me your farther and your brother, so that I will write for Abubakar a statement.’ Then he said: ‘Allah and the believers will not agree but on Abubakar.’ In another version is added the phrase: ‘So that nobody will covet this affair’” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** And in another hadith he stated: ***“I have desired to invite your father and your brother so that I write a statement and make a will so that somebody will not say I more deserved it or somebody will covet it; but Allah will prevent and the believers will not agree - but on Abubakar” (Bukhari).*** Thus the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) explained that he want to write a documented will out of fear that some people will contest for the caliphate, but he understood that the matter is very clear and will not demand conflict or disagreement; the Islamic community is just weaned by its Messenger, they are the best people (community) ever raised for mankind and they are the best generation of this community, therefore they will not have conflict on this explicit and very clear matter. Conflict is generated by lack of knowledge or evil intention and those wto things are unacceptable among them and rejected by them. Surely, knowledge of the virtues of Abubakar is very clear and evil intention will not occur from the general community that is the best generation and that is why the Messenger of Allah said: ***“Allah and the believers will not agree but on Abubakar.”*** So, he relegated and abandone writing a documented will because he knew that the clarity of Abubakar’s virtues and his being chosen as the Caliph after him do not need documented will; it

is dispensed with. Thus he left it because it is not needed, the virtues of as-Siddiq are very clear so also his being the more deserved; and these are better than will. [\[32\]](#)

SEGMENT: METHOD OF ESTABLISHING IMAMAH

The Rafidi scholar stated: "They (Ahlus Sunnah) are saying that the Imam after the Prophet (s.a.w) is Abubakar because Umar has given the vow of allegiance to him with the consent of four people." We (Ibn Taimiyyah) reply to him as follows: This is not the statement of Ahlus Sunnah scholars although some scholastic theologians are saying that Imamah can be established if four people gave their vow of allegiance (to a person); some of them say with the allegiance of two people and others say with the allegiance one person, but this is not the opinions of Ahlus Sunnah scholars. According to Ahlus Sunnah Imamah can be established with the allegiance of people with influence (those who can bind and unbind) and a person cannot be an Imam until he is agreed upon by them for it is with their allegiance that the goal of Imamah is attained and can be achieved. This is because the goal of Imamah can only be attained with strength, power and authority, so if a person is given allegiance and he acquired power and authority through it he has become the Imam. That is why the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah said whoever acquired power and authority by which he can be able to discharge the responsibilities of leadership, then he become among those with authorities who Allah has commanded to be obeyed as far as he did not command disobedience to Allah. Thus, Imamah is power and authority and a person cannot become a leader by the support one or two or four people until he get the support of other people with which he acquire authority. This is the condition for any matter that need aid to be discharged; it cannot be attained until if there are aids and helpers that help towards its attainment and that is why when Ali bin Abi Talib was given the vows of allegiance and on his side are men of influence, he became the Imam (leader).

With regard to his words (the Rafidi): "Then Uthman bin Affan became the leader by Umar's appointment of six men and he is one of them and some of them selected him." The reply is: Uthman did not became the Imam because some of them selected him but because people gave him the vow of allegiance and all the Muslims have given the vow of allegiance to him; nobody stayed back or

withhold his allegiance. Imam Ahmad as narrated by Hamdan bin Ali stated: There is nothing among the people more established than the allegiance to Uthman for it has been by their consensus. When the people with influence, power and fellowship gave him the vow of allegiance he became the Imam, for if it happens that only Abdurrahman bin 'Auf gave him the vow of allegiance and Ali and others of the companions who have influence withheld their allegiance he will not become the Imam.

When Umar (r.a) made selecting the next leader consultation between the six companions: Uthman, Ali, Talha, Zubair, Sa'ad and Abdurrahman bin 'Auf (r.a) and then Talha, Zubair and Sa'ad excluded themselves by their own choice (from consideration for the Caliphate) and only Ali, Uthman and Abdurrahman bin 'Auf remained, the three of them agreed that 'Abdurrahman bin 'Auf shall not seek for the Caliphate and that he shall select one of the two men. Abdurrahman bin 'Auf spent three days - during which he swore that he did not have much sleep - going around and consulting the Muhajirun, Ansar and those who follow their footsteps in goodness, he also consult governors of different regions who have performed the pilgrimage that year with Umar (r.a); and Muslims informed him of their preferring Uthman (r.a) to be their leader. They all forwarded Uthman and gave him the vow of allegiance not because he promised them anything or because he threatened them with any matter. That is why many scholars such as Ayub Sakhtiyani, Ahmad bin Hanbal, Daraqutni and others said: "Whoever preferred Ali over Uthman has surely demeaned the Muhajirun ad Ansar." This is one of the proofs that Uthman is better than Ali because they put him forward by their choice and consultation.

With regard to his words (the Rafidi): "Then Ali was appointed by people's allegiance to him." His particularization and specifying Ali as the only one who has been given vow of allegiance by all the Muslims, thereby excluding Abubakar, Umar and Uthman is clearly false. This is because whoever know the history and conduct of the Prophet's companions knew that their agreement and giving the vow of allegiance to Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman are greater than their

agreement and giving the vow of allegiance to Ali (r.a). And everybody knows that their agreement on giving Uthman allegiance is greater than their agreement on giving allegiance to Ali. Those who gave the vow of allegiance to Uthman, right from the beginning are better than those who gave the vow of allegiance to Ali, because he was given allegiance by Ali, Abdurrahman bin 'Auf, Talha, Zubair, Abdullah bin Mas'ud, Abbas bin Abdulmuttalib, Ubay bin Ka'ab and similar men with rest of mind, calmness and tranquility and that was after consulting Muslims for three consecutive days. With regard to Ali (r.a), he was given the vow of allegiance after the murder of Uthman (r.a) and at that time people's hearts are unsettled, and distressed and their thoughts differed, this in addition to the fact that most of the big companions have different opinions and Talha (r.a) was summoned, some people says that he was summoned by force. At that time the people who killed Uthman have power in Madina and people were greatly aroused and distressed by his murder. Many of the Prophet's companions did not give vow of allegiance to Ali such as Abdullah bin Umar. People split into three groups with regard to Ali (r.a), a group fought with him, a group fought him and a group did not fight him and they did not fight with him; then how can it be stated that all people have given him vow of allegiance and the something cannot be stated with regard to the other three, knowing that nobody differed with them when they were given allegiance and especially Uthman.

With regard to the vow of allegiance given to Abubakar, it shall be known that nobody refused to give him allegiance except Sa'ad bin Ubadah al-Ansari, because they have selected him for the Caliphate and thus, there remains in his heart some human feelings, but despite that he did not oppose Abubakar, he did not claim any right and he did not aid in committing falsehood. Nay, Ahmad bin Hambal recorded in his Musnad that Abubakar said to Sa'ad bin Ubadah on the day of Saqifa: ***“You surely know O Sa'ad that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has said: Quraish are the basis and those with authority of this affair, therefore obedience of people is with them. Sa'ad said: ‘You have told the truth; you are the rulers***

and we are the ministers”. This hadith, although it is a Mursal (forwarded)^[33] it is faultless (Hasanun) and might be the narrator reported it from one of the companions who were present at Saqifa; it contained a very important benefit because it showed that Sa'ad has abandoned his claim to the Caliphate and left it for as-Siddiq (may Allah forgive all of them).

If the Rafidi say: What I mean is that Ahlus Sunnah are saying that his Caliphate was established due to the allegiance given to him by the people and not by text. The reply is that: Undoubtedly, the Ahlus Sunnah are saying; there are texts telling us that Ali (r.a) is one of the guided, righteous Caliphs because the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has said that the Caliphate after Prophethood will be for thirty years. Furthermore, there are many texts establishing the Caliphate of other than him and this is something known by the scholars of hadith for there are many hadiths on the soundness of their Caliphate while those concerning Imam Ali are little. Moreover, the goals and objectives of leadership were achieved through the first three Caliphs; unbelievers were fought and countries were conquered, but during the Caliphate of Ali no unbeliever is fought and no country is conquered for the sword is between the Muslims.

With regard to texts and proofs that the Shia Rafidah are claiming (on Imamah of Ali), they are just like the texts that are being claimed by Rawundiyyah regarding Abbas bin Abdulmuttalib and the falsity of all of them is known out of necessity by people of knowledge. If what is with Shia are the only proofs for the Caliphate of Imam Ali, his Caliphate will never be proven or established with any sound evidence and the same thing can be said about the Caliphate of Abbas.

As for the statement of the Rafidi that with regard to Ahlus Sunnah: “And then they differed, some of them says the Caliph after him (Ali) is Hasan and others said nay, it is Mu'awiyah.” The reply to this is that: Ahlus Sunnah never differed on this matter for they knew that Hasan was given allegiance by the people of Iraq to succeed his father and the people of Syria are already with Mu'awiyah (as their governor).

His claim that: “Thereafter, they place the Imamah among Bani Ummayah and latter in Bani Abbas.” The reply is that: Ahlus Sunnah never says that one of those must be the ruler in disregard to other people and they never say that obedience to him (the ruler) is compulsory in whatever he commanded. The Ahlus Sunnah only accepts the reality and they command what Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) has commanded. They are saying, those people have taken over the Caliphate and they have power and authority by which they can be able to achieve the objectives of governance, such as exerting legal punishments, managing the nations wealth (and resources), appointing governors, fighting the enemies (protecting Muslims from aggression and spreading the words of Allah), upholding pilgrimage and ceremonies, collecting taxes (Zakat) and carrying other duties. Ahlus Sunnah all believe that all those rulers and their representative shall not be obeyed in disobedience to Allah the Exalted – but they are associated in whatever they do of obedience to Allah; unbelievers are fought with them, prayers are performed with them so also the pilgrimage and the two Eids,^[34] they are also associated and aided in exerting the laws, commanding the doing of good and forbidding the committing of evil, so they are aided on righteousness, piety and fear of Allah and they are not aided on aggression and sin. It is naturally known that people will never attain well being, peace and happiness without leaders and that if some persons who are below the status those people and who are unjust take over leadership of the community, that will be better than their none existence. There is a maxim which says “sixty years with unjust leader is better than one night without any.” It was narrated that Imam Ali (r.a) said: ***“There is no escape for people from ruler whether good or evil.” It was said to him we knew a good leadership but how about the evil one? He replied: “roads ways are protected, legal punishments will be exerted, the enemies will be fought, and nation’s resources will be shared.”*** This was mentioned by Ali bin Ma’abad (a Shia scholar of Bagdad) in his book at-Ta’ah wal-Ma’asiyyah.^[35] Whoever becomes the ruler is better than the none existent, the awaited (Shia

Mahdi), who the Rafidah are saying is the authority, because nothing beneficial has occurred due to his Imamah (leadership); absolutely nothing, neither religious benefits nor worldly benefits and there is no gain in his leadership; excepts false beliefs, deceptive and elusive hopes, putting the nation into troubles and waiting for the one that will never come and thus, ages are spent (and wasted) and the benefits of this Imam are never attained.^[36]

People cannot live for few days without leaders because their welfare, safety and prosperity will be damaged, then how can their well-being be put right if they do not have an Imam except the unknown, his words are not known and he can never be able to discharge any of the responsibilities of Imamah; nay he is none existent? With regard to his parents; it is known that they never have authority and power of Imamah; but there are among them scholars who have Imamah of scholarship of hadith, giving religious verdict and similar matters; but they never have authority and administrative influence and therefore, they cannot be able to exercise power whether they are the most deserving of being rulers or they are not. At all instances they have never been established as rulers and the objective of authority has never been attained through them due to lack of authority and power; even if a believer obey them he will not attain by their obedience the benefits that are attained by obeying those leaders with authority, such as fighting the enemies, delivering rights to those who deserved them or some of them and implementing the Islamic laws. If somebody says: Surely one of those (Shia Imams) or all of them has been leaders with authority and power by which the objectives of leadership are attained. We reply: This is nothing but arrogance against reality and rejection of the truth. If that is true there will never be anybody exercising authority with them or without them and this is something that has never been stated by anybody. If it said that: They are Imams by the definition that it is imperative that they be the leaders and that people sinned by not giving them authority. This is just like saying so and so person shall have been the judge but he was not given the

responsibility unjustly, aggressively and they (those who refused to appoint him) have therefore disobeyed Allah.

It is well known that Ahlus Sunnah are not objecting to the fact that sometimes – after the four Caliphs – some of those with influence used to give leadership to someone although other than him more deserved it. Umar bin Abdulaziz want to appoint Qasim bin Muhammad to rule after him but he was not able to appoint him because the people with influence did not agree to his suggestion. In such situation, it is the people of influence that choose the less preferred person and abandoned the best. The one who became the ruler by force or with the power of his followers, unjustly and aggressively; the sin of such a leadership is upon the one who abandoned his responsibility intentionally although he can be able to shoulder it or aided injustice. As for the one who did not commit injustice and he did not aid the unjust, then such a person has aided righteousness and piety and thus there is nothing on him of blame. It is well known that the righteous believers do not aid leaders other than in righteousness and piety and they never aid them in sin and transgression.

Ahlu Sunnah are saying that it is necessary to appoint the best to the position of authority as far as possible either obligatory – according to most of them – or it is preferable to do that – according to some of them; and that whoever did not appoint the best though he is able to do so due to his vain desire, he is an unjust person. Whoever cannot be able to appoint the best though he loves to do so is excused. They are also saying that whoever became the ruler his aids shall be sought in obedience to Allah according to his ability, he shall not be aided but in obedience to Allah, his aid shall not be sought in disobedience to Allah and he shall not be aided in disobedience to Allah. Are the words of Ahlus Sunnah in Imamah not better than the words of the one who is commanding obedience to the none existent, or a weak person who cannot be able to provide necessary aid among the Imams? This is why Shia Rafidah, when they rejected the beliefs of Ahlus Sunnah in aiding Muslims rulers

and seeking their aids they ended up aiding unbelievers and seeking their aid.

The Rafidah are claiming infallible Imam and they do not have an existing Imam whose directives they can follow except those of an unbeliever or an unjust ruler. They are like some ignorant masses that put their trusts on “friends of Allah, men of the unseen” and they do not possess any men of the unseen except deceivers and liars, who eat peoples property through deception and falsehood and hinders people from the path of Allah or a Jinni or a Satan with whom they acquire some Satanic states.

If it assumed that what Rafidah are claiming with regard to textual appointment of Imams is true and that people did not appoint the one who has been textually appointed, in that state it would be said that people left the one who they shall have appointed necessarily. And since they have appointed other than him, then the person who discharged the objectives of Imamah is the leader and not the rejected and overpowered person. Yes if there is a person who deserved more to be appointed but he is not appointed, the blame is upon the one who abandoned his right and not the one who did not abandon his right and did not misplace him.

Shia Rafidah are saying: “It is incumbent upon Allah to appoint an Imam because he is a grace and benefit to slaves of Allah.” Then if Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) knew that people will not give the appointed one authority if they are asked to appoint him, then it would have been better for them to command the appointment of the one they knew people will appoint him and benefit from his leadership. In similar manner as it is being said on leadership of prayer and appointment of judges and so forth. Then, how do you view it when you find that their claims to textual appointment is one of the greatest lies and fabrications? The Messenger of Allah has informed his community concerning what will happen and what will occur after him of differentiation. If the Prophet (s.a.w) made will for a person that he knew will not be selected and instead they will relegate him and appoint another person – with whom they will attain the goal of leadership and authority – and that when responsibility

and authority is given to the one that has been appointed by text a lot of blood of the people in the Islamic community will be shed, an affair that will not happen during the time of the person who has not been appointed by text, and the objectives of authority will not be attained as they were attained with the person who has not been appointed by text; then it is imperative to abandoned the one appointed by text (in favor of the person not textually appointed).

The similitude of that is when the one with authority has two men and he knew that if he appoints one of them (as governor) he will be obeyed (by his subjects) and nations will be conquered; he will fight in the course of Allah and defeat and subdue enemies, while if he appoints the other one he will not be obeyed, no country will be conquered and instead of that tribulations and corruption will occur in the land. It is well known and very clear to all men of intellect that it is obligatory for the one in authority to appoint the person who if he become the governor the objectives of leadership will be achieved of goodness and benefits and not the one who if he appoint him wars and tribulations will occur between him and his subjects. Then, what do you think with regard to the knowledge of Allah and His Messenger concerning the three Caliphates; and what happened during their times of benefits and well fare to the Islamic community in its religion and its worldly affairs; so he will not obligate it but instead he will obligate upon people the authority of the one who will not be obeyed, but instead he will be fought to the extent that he will not be able to subdue the enemies and he cannot be able to rectify the virtuous? Can anybody obligate the authority of the latter instead of the former other than an ignorant person who does not know the true situation or an unjust and corrupt person; if he knew? Allah and His Messenger are free from ignorance and injustice.

The Shia Rafidah are ascribing to Allah and His Messenger abandonment of what is beneficial to the slave of Allah to that which contained nothing but corruption. If you (Rafidi) say: The corruption occurred due to their disobedience and not to his failings. We reply: Is the authority of those who will be obeyed and by which benefits will be attained more preferable over that of the one that will be

disobeyed and thus benefits will not occur but corruption?

If a man has a child and there are two teachers, if he delivers him to one of them he will learn and be of good conducts and if he deliver him to the other teacher he will run away; is it not better to deliver him to the former? If we assume that the latter is better; what benefit is there in his being the best if the child did not attain from him any benefit due to his running away from him?

If a woman is sought in marriage by two people and one of them is better than the other but the woman hates him and if she is married to him she will not obey him, but instead of that she will fight him and harm him. Thus, she will not benefit from him and he will not benefit from her; but she loves the other and with him the objectives of marriage will be achieved. Isn't marrying her to the less preferred better by the consensus of those with intellect? The textual command of the one who obligated marrying her to latter is preferable over the textual command of the one obligated marrying to the former one.

How can it be ascribed to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) an opinion that can only be accepted by the unjust or the ignorant? This and similar arguments is one of the ways to know and uncover the falsity of the claimed textual appointment for Ali (r.a), on the assumption that he is the best and the more deserved to take over authority, but nothing will happen in his government other than what has happened (of civil wars) while other him who is "unjust" (according to Rafidah), a lot of benefits will occur during the time he hold authority. Then, how about if the matter is not as claimed (by Rafidah) neither in that case nor in this case?

The word of Ahlus Sunnah is a true story and a wise statement while the word of Rafidah is false story and foolish statement. Ahlus Sunnah are saying that the successor, leader and Imam who exist is the one who has power and who has the ability to discharge and carry out the responsibilities of leadership and achieve the objectives of authority; just like the Imam of prayer, is the one who is leading people in prayer and they are following him in prayer and not the

person who deserved to lead prayer but he is not leading anybody, but he ought to be the Imam. The difference between the Imam and the one who ought to be the Imam is very clear to even the common people.

The (Ahlu Sunnah) are also saying they (leaders) are aided on righteousness and piety and not in sin and transgression, they are also obeyed in obedience to Allah and not in disobedience to Him and that the subjects shall not rebel against them with the sword. Many hadiths of the Messenger of Allah have explained this matter clearly.

It come in the Sahihain (Bukhari and Muslim) on the authority of Abdullah bin Abbas who said, the Messenger of Allah said: ***“Whoever perceive from his leader what he hates shall be patient over that for whoever rebelled against the leader by a hand span and he die he has died the death of ignorance.”*** Thus, he (the Messenger of Allah) warned against rebelling against the ruler (with sword) and abandoning the community and he advised people to be patient on what they hates from the conduct of the leader; these commands are not specific to a particular leader, or a particular governor or a particular group or community (but they are universal).

CHAPTER TWO: ON THE SHOOL OF THOUGHT THAT MUST BE FOLLOWED

The Rafidi scholar stated: “The second chapter; surely it is obligatory to follow the sect of (Shia) Imamiyyah because it is the most deserved sect and the most truthful; because they have differed from all sects in principles of beliefs; they are sure of success in the Hereafter and they have taken their religion from the infallibles. Other than the Shia Imamiyyah have differed and they have many opinions and vain desires: Some of them sought the Caliphate for himself (after the Messenger of Allah) without right and most of the people followed him desiring this world. Some of them become confused concerning the true affair, therefore when he saw the one seeking for the world he supported his leadership; he failed in his evaluation and thus deserved censure of Allah. Some of them supported him due to his short sightedness and because he saw a large crowd, he gave his allegiance thinking that a large crowd means being right thereby forgetting the words of Allah: “... **And they are a few...**” (38:24). And: “...**But few of My slaves are grateful...**” (34:13). Some of them sought the affair by right and he was given allegiance by the very few who shunned the worldly embellishments, became sincere and they followed the one they were obligated to obey for he is the one who deserved to be the leader. Therefore, it is obligatory to follow the truth, be fair, and do the right thing. Allah the Exalted said: “... **the curse of Allah on the unjust...**” (11:18).

Ibn Taimiyyah stated: This Rafidi writer has grouped people after their Messenger into four groups and this is a clear lie and one of the biggest slanders and fabrications because it is not known among the known Prophet’s companions anybody who belonged to any of those groups. With regard to your words “the one who sought the Caliphate for himself without right” – like Abubakar according to his claim – or the “one who sought it by right” – like Ali according to his claim;” these are lies against both Ali and Abubakar (r.a) because Ali did not seek for the Caliphate for himself and neither Abubakar. He

made the other two groups into either the one who sought for the world or the one who is short sighted in discerning the truth.

It is incumbent upon man to know the truth and follow it and that is the straight path upon which those who Allah has bestowed His Mercy upon them are treading among the Prophets, the truthful, the martyrs and the righteous and not (the way) of those who earned Allah's Anger (such as the Jews who knew the truth and refused to follow it), nor of those who went astray (such as the Christians who did not know the truth). This is the path we are commanded to follow by Allah and to supplicate to Him to guide us upon it in our prayers, nay in each unit of prayer.

This nation is the best of nations for mankind, Allah said: **“You [true believers in Islamic Monotheism, and real followers of Prophet Muhammad SAW and his Sunnah (legal ways, etc.)] are the best of peoples ever raised up for mankind; you enjoin Al-Ma'ruf (i.e. Islamic Monotheism and all that Islam has ordained) and forbid Al-Munkar (polytheism, disbelief and all that Islam has forbidden), and you believe in Allah. And had the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) believed, it would have been better for them; among them are some who have faith, but most of them are Al-Fasiqun (disobedient to Allah - and rebellious against Allah's Command)” (4:110);** and the best of this nation is its first century; for the first century is better in beneficial knowledge and good works and the Messenger of Allah said that with regard to them, when he stated: ***“The best of people are those in my period and then those who come after them.”*** Those liars (Shia Rafidah) are saying concerning them (the Prophet companions) contrary to that because they are not among those who know the truth and follow it, nay most of them knew the truth, but they are rejecting it.

Among what this liar (Rafidi) stated are: When the Muslims community was overtaken and covered by distress after the death of their Messenger (s.a.w), people differed after him and their pinions differed just as their vain desires conflict with each other. Some people sought the Caliphate for himself and most of the people followed him seeking for this world, just like the manner Umar bin

Sa'ad bin Malik (one of the Ummayyad governors) preferred his vain desires when he was asked to choose between his position and fighting Husain (r.a) although he knew that the killer of Husain is in Hell-Fire, but he chose to fight him.

We say: This statement contained apparent liars, falsehood and censure against the best of this community without right.

Firstly, his words; "their opinions differed just as their vain desires conflict with each other," entailed that they are all followers of vain desires and none of them is seeking for the truth, neither is there anybody among them who desire the countenance of Allah or want eternal home of the Hereafter, and there isn't anybody among them whose action or words are based on textual proofs or effort to understand and follow the truth. His general expression encompassed Imam Ali and others (r.a). Those people who this Rafidi described with these description are the people who Allah and His Messenger praised; whom He said He is pleased with and promised them goodness (in this world and the Hereafter. Allah said: **"And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun (those who migrated from Makkah to Al-Madinah) and the Ansar (the citizens of Al-Madinah who helped and gave aid to the Muhajirun) and also those who followed them exactly (in Faith). Allah is well-pleased with them as they are well-pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow (Paradise), to dwell therein forever; That is the supreme success" (9:100).**

Allah the Exalted also said: **"Muhammad (SAW) is the Messenger of Allah, and those who are with him are severe against disbelievers, and merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and falling down prostrate (in prayer), seeking Bounty from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure. The mark of them (i.e. of their Faith) is on their faces (foreheads) from the traces of (their) prostration (during prayers). This is their description in the Taurat (Torah). But their description in the Injeel (Gospel) is like a (sown) seed which sends forth its shoot, then makes it strong, it then becomes thick, and it stands straight on its stem,**

delighting the sowers that He may enrage the disbelievers with them. Allah has promised those among them who believe (i.e. all those who follow Islamic Monotheism, the religion of Prophet Muhammad SAW till the Day of Resurrection) and do righteous good deeds, forgiveness and a mighty reward (i.e. Paradise)” (48:29).

Allah the Exalted also said: “Verily, those who believed, and emigrated and strove hard and fought with their property and their lives in the Cause of Allah as well as those who gave (them) asylum and help, - these are (all) allies to one another..” – to the words of Allah: “And those who believed, and emigrated and strove hard in the Cause of Allah (Al-Jihad), as well as those who gave (them) asylum and aid; - these are the believers in truth, for them is forgiveness and a generous provision (i.e. Paradise)” (8:72-74).

Allah also said: “And what is the matter with you that you spend not in the Cause of Allah? And to Allah belongs the heritage of the heavens and the earth. Not equal among you are those who spent and fought before the conquering (of Makkah) (with those among you who did so later). Such are higher in degree than those who spent and fought afterwards. But to all, Allah has promised the best (reward). And Allah is All-Aware of what you do” (57:10).

Allah the exalted, the Sublime said also concerning them: “(And there is also a share in this booty) for the poor emigrants, who were expelled from their homes and their property, seeking Bounties from Allah and to please Him. And helping Allah (i.e. helping His religion) and His Messenger (Muhammad SAW). Such are indeed the truthful (to what they say);- And those who, before them, had homes (in Al-Madinah) and had adopted the Faith, love those who emigrate to them, and have no jealousy in their breasts for that which they have been given (from the booty of Bani An-Nadir), and give them (emigrants) preference over themselves, even though they were in need of that. And whosoever is saved from his own covetousness, such are they

who will be the successful. And those who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who have believed. Our Lord! You are indeed full of kindness, Most Merciful" (59:8-10). All these verses contained praises to the Muhajirun and Ansar and those who came after them are commanded to seek for Allah's forgiveness for them and to supplicate to Him not to put in their hearts any hatred or rancor against anyone of them, the verses also showed that those groups of people deserved spoil of war.

There is no any doubt that Shia Rafidah are outside the confines of the above three mentioned groups for they do not seek forgiveness for the Muhajirun and Ansar (and those who followed them in goodness) and in their hearts there is hatred of them. In the verses there are praises for the Muhajirun and Ansar and Ahlus Sunnah who love them and the exclusion of Rafida. It is reported that Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas (r.a) said: "People are on three degrees, two degrees are gone, what remained is one degree, so it is better for you to be on the one that remained." And then he read: **"For the poor emigrants, who were expelled from their homes and their property, seeking Bounties from Allah and to please Him..."** he commented upon it saying those are the Muhajirun and this degree has gone, then he read: **"And those who, before them, had homes and had adopted the Faith, love those who emigrate to them, and have no jealousy in their breasts for that which they have been given and give them (emigrants) preference over themselves, even though they were in need of that..."** and he commented upon it saying: Those are the Ansar and this degree has gone. Thereafter he read: **"And those who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who have believed. Our Lord! You are indeed full of kindness, Most Merciful" (59:8-10).** Thereafter he commented saying: Those two degrees have passed and this one remained and the best situation you can be is to live on this degree by seeking for Allah's forgiveness

for them. Anas bin Malik (r.a) said: ***“Whoever curses the predecessors has no share in spoil of war, because Allah said: ‘And those who came after them...’”*** And this verdict is known as given by Imam Malik and other scholars such as Abi 'Ubaid al-Qasim bin Salam. Hukaim bin Muqsim reported on the authority of Abdullah bin Abbas saying: ***“Allah commanded that forgiveness shall be sought for the companions of Messenger of Allah and He knew that they will fight with each other.”*** 'Urwah said, Aisha (r.a) said: ***“O son of my sister, they have been commanded to supplicate for forgiveness for the Prophet's companions but they are abusing them.”*** Abu Sa'id al-Khudri (r.a) narrated that the Prophet said (s.a.w) said: ***“Do not abuse my companions for if any one of you spent gold equal to Uhud (in Allah's Cause) it would not be equal to a Mud (a dry measure used for measuring dates etc.) or even a half Mud spent by one of them” (Bukhari).*** In another hadith Abu Huraira (r.a) reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: ***“Do not revile my Companions, do not revile my Companions. By Him in Whose Hand is my life, if one amongst you would have spent as much gold as Uhud it would not amount to as much as one much on behalf of one of them or half of it” (Muslim).*** Jabir bin Abdullah (r.a) said, Aisha (r.a) was informed that some people are cursing and censuring Abubakar and Umar. She replied: ***“What are you wondering about that? Their good works have been stopped by their death and Allah wished that recompense will not cut up from them.” (Muslim).*** Nasser bin Za'alunq was reported to have said, I heard Abdullah bin Umar saying: ***“Do not abuse the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w) because the company of one of them for an hour with the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is better than the good acts of one for you for forty years.”*** In another version of the narration: ***“Is better than acts of worship of any of you throughout his life.”***

Allah the Most High has said: ***“Indeed, Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave their pledge to you (O Muhammad) under the tree, He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down As-Sakinah (calmness and tranquility) upon them, and He***

rewarded them with a near victory; And abundant spoils that they will capture. And Allah is Ever All-Mighty, All-Wise. And other (victories and much booty there are, He promises you) which are not yet within your power, indeed Allah compasses them, And Allah is Ever Able to do all things” (48:18-21).

Allah the Most High has informed us in the above mentioned verses that He is pleased with them, He knew what is in their hearts and He promised them a near victory. Those who are described in the above quoted verses are the same people that gave vow of allegiance to Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman after the death of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); none among the Muslims can go before them because all of them knew their virtues and because Allah has explained their virtue in the Qur'an: **“... Not equal among you are those who spent and fought before the conquering (of Makka) (with those among you who did so later). Such are higher in degree than those who spent and fought afterwards. But to all, Allah has promised the best (reward). And Allah is All-Aware of what you do” (57:10).** Thus Allah preferred those who fought in His path before the conquest of Makka over all other people. What is meant by conquest here is the Hudabiyyah treaty. For this reason, the Messenger of Allah was asked: ***“Is it victory?” He replied: “Yes” (Abu Dawud).*** And the scholars knew that it is concerning it that Allah revealed: **“Verily, We have given you (O Muhammad) a manifest victory. That Allah may forgive you your sins of the past and the future, and complete His Favor on you, and guide you on the Straight Path; And that Allah may help you with strong help” (48:1).** At that moment some believers said to the Prophet (s.a.w), O Messenger of Allah this is for you; how about us and it was revealed: **“Indeed, Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave their pledge to you (O Muhammad) under the tree, He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down As-Sakinah (calmness and tranquility) upon them, and He rewarded them with a near victory;”**

These verses are textual proofs on preferring those who spent and fought in the way of Allah before the conquest of Makka to those

who spent after it. For this reason most of the scholars believe that the first to embrace Islam in the words of Allah the Most High: **“And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and the Ansar...” (9:100)**; are the people who spent before the victory and fought in the way of Allah and all the people who gave the allegiance of Ridwan (being pleased) under the tree and their number exceeded one thousand four hundred men. Some scholars opined that the pacesetters of Islam are those who prayed towards the two Qiblas (directions of prayer, al-‘Aqsa mosque and Ka’aba). But this is a weak opinion because praying to the abrogated Qibla is not a virtue in itself. The abrogation is not one of their works by which they can be preferred and because preference with praying to the two Qiblas has not been indicated and supported by the law as it has supported preference by being a pacesetter; by spending for the sake of Allah, fighting in the way of Allah and giving allegiance under the tree.

It is well known out of necessity that among the first to embrace Islam who gave their vows of allegiance under the tree there are Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Talha, and Zubair and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) gave the vow of allegiance on behalf of Uthman because he was absent due to a duty given to him by the Prophet (s.a.w), by sending him to Makka to deliver his message. The people gave the allegiance because an information come to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) that he was killed and thus the allegiance was given to fight until death to avenge Uthman, but the information was latter found to be false. It is recorded in Muslim on the authority of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) who said: ***“None of those who gave vow of allegiance under the tree will enter Hell Fire.”*** And Allah said: **“Allah has forgiven the Prophet (s.a.w), the Muhajirun (Muslim emigrants who left their homes and came to Al-Madinah) and the Ansar (Muslims of Al-Madinah) who followed him (Muhammad) in the time of distress (Tabuk expedition, etc.), after the hearts of a party of them had nearly deviated (from the Right Path), but He accepted their repentance. Certainly, He is unto them full of Kindness, Most Merciful” (9:117).** In this verse, Allah joined them with the Messenger of Allah

in forgiveness. In another verse Allah said: **““Verily, those who believed, and emigrated and strove hard and fought with their property and their lives in the Cause of Allah as well as those who gave (them) asylum and help, - these are (all) allies to one another..”** – to the words of Allah: **“And those who believed, and emigrated and strove hard in the Cause of Allah (Al-Jihad), as well as those who gave (them) asylum and aid; - these are the believers in truth, for them is forgiveness and a generous provision (i.e. Paradise). And those who believed afterwards, and emigrated and strove hard along with you, (in the Cause of Allah) they are of you. But kindred by blood are nearer to one another regarding inheritance in the decree ordained by Allah. Verily, Allah is the All-Knower of everything” (8:72-74).** Allah the Sublime also confirmed and affirmed love, affection, and mutual aid between them and the believers: **“O you who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as Auliya' (friends, protectors, helpers, etc.), they are but Auliya' to one another. And if any amongst you takes them as Auliya', then surely he is one of them. Verily, Allah guides not those people who are the Zalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers and unjust).”** – To the words of Allah: **“Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (prayer), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer)” (5:51-56).** These verses affirmed their mutual love and their mutual aid and it commanded the believers to love them and support them. But Shia Rafidah are absolving themselves from them and they are not taking them as friends. The source of friendship is love while the source of enmity is hatred, and they hate them and they do not love them.

Some liars have fabricated a false hadith that this verse was revealed concerning Ali (r.a) when he gave out his ring as Zakat and this statement is untrue by the consensus of scholars of hadith and its being a lie is very clear from many perspectives:

Firstly: the word “Those (الذين)” in the verse is plural and Ali (r.a) is single. Secondly, the word “And (الواو)” is not that of condition or

situation of the people in question (so it does not mean “whilst”) for if it is so, then it will not be allowed for anybody to hold authority or to be taken as protector or helper except those who gave Zakat while they are in bowing position in prayer. With this (interpretation) all the Prophets companions (r.a) and members of his family cannot hold authority or be taken as protectors or helpers (for they have not fulfilled the condition). Thirdly, praising usually come after the performance of an obligatory or recommended action and giving out Zakat during prayer is neither obligatory nor recommended by the consensus of the Muslims scholars; and prayer is an enough undertaking and preoccupation. Fourthly, if giving out Zakat while praying is sound there will not be any difference between the positions, whether bowing or not bowing and giving it out while standing or sitting is better. Fifthly, Zakat is not obligatory to Imam Ali (r.a) during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) – because he is poor.^[37] Sixthly, giving out something else as Zakat is better than giving a ring for most of the scholars says that a ring cannot be given out as Zakat. Seventhly, in this fabricated hadith it is stated that he gave the ring to a beggar after he begged while with regard to Zakat a person is only praised if he remove it from his wealth and gave it out immediately without waiting until he is asked. Eighthly, Ali did (r.a) not have a ring either, because they did not wear rings, until the Prophet (s.a.w) wrote a letter to Chosroes, and was told that they would not accept any letter unless it had a seal, so he acquired a ring of silver and had engraved on it the words “Muhammad the Messenger of Allah”. Ninthly, the context of the verses concerns forbidding taking unbelievers as friends, aids, lovers and helpers and taking believers as friends, aids and lovers. This verse will be discussed latter – by the will of Allah - in details, for Shia Rafidah whenever they advance an evidence you will find that it is against them and not for them, like their proving their case with verse on Wilayah (loving, aiding and friending) to mean authority while it is talking about Wilayah that is opposite of enmity. Rafidah are contradicting this verse and Ismailiyyah and Nusairiyyah are befriending unbelievers; the Jews, Christians, polytheists and

hypocrites and they are holding enmity against believers of the Muhajirun, Ansar and those who followed them in goodness to the Last Day. And this is something that is well known as their conduct. They are showing enmity to the chosen, best slaves of Allah, the believers and they are befriend, Jews, Christians, polytheists among the Turks (Mongols and Tartars) and other groups. And Allah the Exalted has said: **“O Prophet (Muhammad)! Allah is Sufficient for you and for the believers who follow you” (8:64)**. Meaning Allah is enough for you and those who follow you of the believers and the Prophet’s companions are the best of those who followed him among the believers and the more deserved of them to be encompassed by this verse. Allah said: **“When comes the Help of Allah (to you, O Muhammad (Peace be upon him) against your enemies) and the conquest (of Makka), And you see that the people enter Allah's religion (Islam) in crowds, So glorify the Praises of your Lord, and ask for His Forgiveness. Verily, He is the One Who accepts the repentance and forgives” (110:1-3)**. The people who the Messenger of Allah saw entering Islam in crowds are those living in his period. And Allah the High said: **“...He it is Who has supported you with His Help and with the believers. And He has united their (i.e. believers') hearts...” (8:62-63)**. Allah aided him during his life with the companions. Allah the Sublime said: **“And he (Muhammad) who has brought the truth (this Quran and Islamic Monotheism) and (those who) believed therein (i.e. the true believers of Islamic Monotheism), those are Al- Muttaqun (the pious and righteous persons). They shall have all that they will desire with their Lord. That is the reward of Muhsinun (good-doers). So that Allah may remit from them the evil of what they did and give them the reward, according to the best of what they used to do” (39:33-35)**. This is the group that is saying the truth and accepted the truth contrary to the group that fabricates lies and disbelieve in the truth. Therefore, these people are the most honored of this community and Allah has promised to forgive them the most evil of what they do.

The Prophet's companions used to believe that there is nobody worthy to be worshipped but Allah alone and the Muhammad (s.a.w) is his Messenger and they are the best of those who came with the truth and accepted the truth after the Prophets and Messengers (a.s) and there is none among the sects that are ascribing themselves to Islam greater liars against Allah (and His Messenger), and rejecters of the truth than Shia Rafidah and that is why there is no extremism and exaggeration in any sect greater than among them.

Among the Shia Rafida there are those who claimed Lordship to human beings, claimed Prophethood to other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and claimed infallibility to Imams and other false beliefs that are not found in all the sects and denominations. Scholars have had a consensus on that there is no group that ascribe itself to Islam who tell more falsehood and lies than them.

Allah the Exalted said: **“Say (O Muhammad): ‘Praise and thanks be to Allah, and peace be on His slaves whom He has chosen (for His Message)...’” (27:59).** A group of our predecessors said they are the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w) and there is no doubt that they are the best of those who are chosen in this community, which Allah said concerning it: **“Then We gave the Book (the Quran) for inheritance to such of Our slaves whom We chose (the followers of Muhammad). Then of them are some who wrong their own selves, and of them are some who follow a middle course, and of them are some who are, by Allah's Leave, foremost in good deeds. That (inheritance of the Quran), that is indeed a great grace. 'Adn (Eden) Paradise (everlasting Gardens) will they enter, therein will they be adorned with bracelets of gold and pearls, and their garments there will be of silk (i.e. in Paradise). And they will say: "All the praises and thanks be to Allah, Who has removed from us (all) grief. Verily, our Lord is indeed OffForgiving, Most Ready to appreciate (good deeds and to recompense). Who, out of His Grace, has lodged us in a home that will last forever; there, toil will touch us not, nor weariness will touch us" (35:32-35).** The community of Muhammad (s.a.w) is the ones that inherited the Book after the

two communities that passed before them; Jews and Christians. Allah has informed us that they are the chosen.

It has been concurrently reported on the authority of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) that he said: ***“The best century is the one in which I was sent (as a Prophet), then the one that come after it and then the one that come after it.”*** And Muhammad (s.a.w) and his companions (r.a) are the chosen from the chosen slaves of Allah. Allah the Most High said: **“Muhammad (s.a.w) is the Messenger of Allah, and those who are with him are severe against disbelievers, and merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and falling down prostrate (in prayer), seeking Bounty from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure. The mark of them (i.e. of their Faith) is on their faces (foreheads) from the traces of (their) prostration (during prayers). This is their description in the Taurat (Torah). But their description in the Injeel (Gospel) is like a (sown) seed which sends forth its shoot, then makes it strong, it then becomes thick, and it stands straight on its stem, delighting the sowers that He may enrage the disbelievers with them. Allah has promised those among them who believe (i.e. all those who follow Islamic Monotheism, the religion of Prophet Muhammad SAW till the Day of Resurrection) and do righteous good deeds, forgiveness and a mighty reward (i.e. Paradise)”** (48:29). Allah the Most High said: **“Allah has promised those among you who believe, and do righteous good deeds, that He will certainly grant them succession to (the present rulers) in the earth, as He granted it to those before them, and that He will grant them the authority to practice their religion, that which He has chosen for them (i.e. Islam). And He will surely give them in exchange a safe security after their fear (provided) they (believers) worship Me and do not associate anything (in worship) with Me. But whoever disbelieved after this, they are the Fasiqun (rebellious, disobedient to Allah)”** (24:55). Allah has promised those who believed and do good righteous deeds that he will give them power and authority in the earth as established successors of the present rulers and He also

promised them forgiveness and a great reward (Paradise) and Allah do not fail in His promise. It also showed that those that He established on earth as He has established those before them is the religion of Islam, because it is the religion that He has chosen for them, as He the Most High said: “... **And has chosen for you Islam as your religion...**” (5:3), and He change for them fear to peace and tranquility and promised them forgiveness and great reward.

This can be used to prove two things: That those who are given successorship, given authority and established in the earth are believers who do good righteous acts, because the promise is for them and not for other than them. It also showed that those people are forgiven and they will have a great reward because they believed and act righteous good deeds; and thus they have been encompassed by the above two verses. It is well known that those descriptions applied to the Prophet's companions (r.a) during the time of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman, because that was the time when Muslims were given authority and succession, religion was established and peace reign after fear when they conquered the Persians and Romans and they open up countries such as Syria, Egypt, Khorasan, and Africa (North Africa). When Uthman was killed tribulation set in and they did not conquer any country of the unbelievers and instead of that unbelievers covet them in Syria and Khorasan and each party is fearing the other party (in those regions).

Therefore, verses of the Qur'an have proved the faith of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and those who are with them at the period of established authority, successorship over the earth, superiority of Islam and peace and those who are at the period of established of authority, successorship over the earth, superiority of Islam and peace, who entered into the era of tribulation such as Ali, Talha, Abu Musa al-'Ash'ari, Zubair, Mu'awiyah, and 'Amr bin 'As etc. are also encompassed in the verse because they have been given successorship, their religion established and have peace.

Groups that came into being at the time of tribulation such as Shia Rafidah – who innovated innovations in Islam – and during the period of tribulation disagreements, and conflicts such as Kharijites

who shot out of Islam; they are not encompassed by those verses for they are directed to the Prophet's companions and they are not among those who believe and do righteous good deeds (innovations are not righteous deeds, nor extremism); they are not established and given successorship over the earth and have not been given peace after fear as has happened to the Prophet's companions; they are still in fear, panic and anxiety and they are un-established (they have neither power nor authority nor peace).

If someone objected and say: Allah promised those who believe and do righteous deeds "among you" and He did not say He promised all of them. We reply: And when He said He promised those who believed and work righteous deeds He did not say He promised you (Rafidah). The word "Min" which is translated as "Among" is called in Arabic language as generic noun, it was brought to show that the above descriptions are not the reason for being forgiven but forgiveness is hinged upon belief and righteous good deeds and thus other people and those who came after them can imitate them so that they can also get Allah's forgiveness. An instance of this is the words of Allah: "... **So shun some of the abomination (worshipping) of idols...**" (22:30). In this verse Allah is forbidding the worship of idol all of it and not some of it (nobody can think that a type of idol worship is good) but the Arabic word "Min" has been used which has been translated here as "some" (which means a part in the two cases). If you say "I have a cloth from silk" is just like your saying "I have cloth of silk," so also saying "a door from iron" is like saying "a door of iron."

If someone says: The hypocrites are apparently and outwardly Muslims. We reply saying: The hypocrites are not described with those (good) descriptions, they have never been with the Messenger of Allah and they are not part of the believers, as Allah the Exalted has said: "**And you see those in whose hearts there is a disease (of hypocrisy), they hurry to their friendship, saying: 'We fear lest some misfortune of a disaster may befall us.'** Perhaps Allah may bring a victory or a decision according to His Will. Then they will become regretful for what they have been keeping as a

secret in themselves. And those who believe will say: 'Are these the men (hypocrites) who swore their strongest oaths by Allah that they were with you (Muslims)?' All that they did has been in vain (because of their hypocrisy), and they have become the losers" (5:52-53). Allah the Sublime, the Most High also said: "Of mankind are some who say: 'We believe in Allah,' but if they are made to suffer for the sake of Allah, they consider the trial of mankind as Allah's punishment, and if victory comes from your Lord, (the hypocrites) will say: 'Verily! We were with you (helping you).' Is not Allah Best Aware of what is in the breast of the 'Alamin (mankind and jinns). Verily, Allah knows those who believe, and verily, He knows the hypocrites [i.e. Allah will test the people with good and hard days to discriminate the good from the wicked (although Allah knows all that before putting them to test)]" (29:10-11). Allah said: "They swear by Allah that they are truly of you while they are not of you, but they are a people (hypocrites) who are afraid (that you may kill them)" (9:56). In another Verse Allah said: "Verily, the hypocrites will be in the lowest depths (grade) of the Fire; no helper will you find for them. Except those who repent (from hypocrisy), do righteous good deeds, hold fast to Allah, and purify their religion for Allah (by worshipping none but Allah, and do good for Allah's sake only, not to show-off), then they will be with the believers. And Allah will grant to the believers a great reward" (4:145-155). Thus Allah has informed that the hypocrites are not part of the believers and they are not people of the Book (but a people who are wandering neither of these nor of those) and this is the state you will find Shia Rafidah because there isn't any group that is showing outward display of Islam more than Rafidah and those who allied with them (while inwardly they are lying). Most of those who have been hypocrites at the time of the Messenger of Allah repented from their hypocrisy and this has been proven by the words of Allah: "If the hypocrites, and those in whose hearts is a disease and those who spread false news among the people in Madina, cease not, We shall certainly let you overpower them, then they will not be able to stay in it as your neighbors but a little while.

Accursed, wherever found, they shall be seized and killed with a (terrible) slaughter. That was the Way of Allah in the case of those who passed away of old, and you will not find any change in the Way of Allah” (33:60). Since Allah did not command his Messenger to deal with them and to seize them and slaughter them a terrible slaughter (as is His way of dealing with past communities) it showed that they have stopped and repented and all the people that are with him at Hudabiyyah gave him their allegiance except al-Jadd bin al-Qais, for he hid himself behind a red Camel. It came on a hadith that all of them will enter Paradise except the one who hid behind the red Camel. Summarily speaking the hypocrites have been suppressed, overcome, overwhelmed and humbled and especially at the last days of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and at the campaign of Tabuk because Allah said: **“They (hypocrites) say: ‘If we return to Madina, indeed the more honorable (‘Abdullah bin Ubai bin Salul, the chief of hypocrites at AlMadinah) will expel therefrom the meaner (i.e. Allah’s Messenger).’ But honor, power and glory belong to Allah, His Messenger (Muhammad), and to the believers, but the hypocrites know not” (63:8).** Allah informed us that honor and glory are for the believers and not the hypocrites and thus power and glory is with the believers and humiliation and degradation is with the hypocrites. Therefore, it is inconceivable that the Prophet’s companions who have been the most honored Muslims to be of the hypocrites, nay this entailed that the one who is more honored is greater in faith.

It is well known that the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar, the right guided Caliphs and others are the most honored people, and all these showed that hypocrites have been degraded and humbled by the believers. Thus, the honored companions are not of them, but all the descriptions of the hypocrites are applicable to Shia Rafidah and others like them; hypocrisy and atheism among Shia Rafidah is greater than in any other sect. Nay each one of them possess a branch of hypocrisy because it is the base upon which lies are constructed; that one will say with his tongue that which is not in his heart as Allah has informed concerning the hypocrites. Now, Shia

Rafida has made this a principle of its religion and it called it Taqiyyah (dissimulation) and they ascribed those things to the scholars of the Prophet's family – and Allah has absolved them from that – to the extent of saying that Imam Ja'afar as-Sadiq said: "Taqiyyah is my religion and the religion of my parents."^[38] And Allah has absolved, freed and protected the believers of the Prophet's family, his progeny and other people from that and He did not make them dependent on it and thus they are the most truthful men and greater in faith; their religion is piety and not dissimulation. With regard to the words of Allah: **"Let not the believers take the disbelievers as Auliya (supporters, helpers, etc.) instead of the believers, and whoever does that will never be helped by Allah in any way, except if you indeed fear a danger from them. And Allah warns you against Himself (His Punishment), and to Allah is the final return" (3:28).** This is a permission to hide your religion from unbelievers if you fear that they will harm you and not a directive to tell lies or commit hypocrisy. Allah has permitted the person who is forced to renounce Islam to do so, while keeping his belief intact in his heart, and family of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his progeny were never forced by anybody to do anything of that nature (i.e. to renounce faith) and Abubakar (r.a) never force any one among them to swear allegiance to him; but they all swore allegiance to him by their free will and choice. Neither Imam Ali (r.a) nor anyone (from the family of the Prophet) mentions virtues of the Prophet's companions and praises them out of fear of anybody and nobody forced them to do so by the consensus of all (fair minded) people.

During the reigns of Bani Ummayah and Bani Abbas there are many people who are lower than Imam Ali (r.a) in faith and piety and who objected many things from those Caliphs, they do not praise them, they do not mention them with good and they do not love them or go near them or fear them, despite all these those rulers did not force them (to love them or support them). The right guided Caliphs have been the farthest away of all men – from forcing people and punishing them over their obedience than all other rulers. There are many Muslims war captives under the Unbelievers and all of them

are openly practicing their religion, then how can anybody think that Ali and his children (r.a) are weaker in religion than war captives and from subjects of unjust rulers! It has come to us by concurrent reports that Ali (r.a) and his children were never forced by anybody to mention the virtues of the three Caliphs, but they have been speaking about their virtues and supplicating for them Allah's mercy and they mentions their virtues to their close companions. They are never forced by the Caliphs to do that but Shia Rafidah are saying that the family of the Prophet (s.a.w) tell lies, give false witness and display unbelief without being forced to that by anybody.

Therefore, what Shia Rafidah are displaying are nothing but lies, hypocrisy and deception and they are stating with their tongues that which is not in their hearts, not from the consideration of what a Muslim is forced to do of uttering unbelief; here are war captives of Muslims living in the countries of unbelievers and they are practicing their religion and displaying their faiths. The Kharijites who are excommunicating all Muslims, Uthman and Ali and whoever love them, from Islam are showing their creed and practicing their religion (without molestation or forced to renounce that).

How can anybody say or think that Imam Ali (r.a) and other men of the Prophet's family have weaker faith than war captives who are held by unbelievers or that the generality of Ahlus Sunnah or Kharijites are greater than them in faith? Furthermore, we knew that nobody has forced Imam Ali (r.a) or his children to mention the virtues of the Caliphs and pray for forgiveness for them, nay they have been stating that without being forced and one of them will speak about that to his closest companions; all these have been affirmed by concurrent narrations.

Summarily, there isn't any statement in the Qur'an about believers, righteous, good doers, those who fear Allah and their praising except that the Prophet's companions are the first people included in that mention in this community and the best of all people that are encompassed by that mention from this community as the Messenger of Allah has said: ***"The best century is the period in***

which I am sent, then the one that follow it and then the one that follow it."

Secondly, The Shia Rafidi stated: "Some of them sought the affair (Caliphate) without right and most of the people gave him allegiance desiring this world."

By the above statement, the Rafidi means Abubakar. It is well known that Abubakar never sought for the Caliphate for himself either by right or without right, but instead of that, he said: ***"I recommend for you either Umar or Abu Ubaidah."*** Umar said: ***"I swear by Allah, I preferred to offer my neck to be cut up (be killed) than be a leader of a community in which there are the like of Abubakar; if that will not take me close to disobeying Allah"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). It was narrated that Abubakar said: ***"Take away this responsibility from me, take away this responsibility from me."***

Thus Muslims choose him and paid allegiance to him, because they knew that he is the best among them, just as Umar (r.a) said in the day of Saqifa before a great number of Muhajirun and Ansar: ***"You are our master, the best among us and the most beloved to the Messenger of Allah of all of us"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). And nobody among them objected to what he has said. Therefore the Muslims choose him, just like the Messenger of Allah told Aisha in a sound hadith: ***"Call for me your father and your brother so that I can write for Abubakar a document by which people will not disagree on after me, then he added: Allah and the believers will not agree that anybody will lead other than Abubakar."***

Thirdly, let us assume that he sought for the Caliphate and most of the people gave him their allegiance, your (Shia Rafidah) claim that he is seeking for the world is a clear lie. Abubakar did not give them any material benefit for he has spent all his property and wealth during the life of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). There was a time when the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) encouraged and motivated his companions (r.a) to spend in the path of Allah and Abubakar brought all his wealth and gave it to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). When asked by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w): ***"What have you left for your family?"*** He replied: ***"I left for them Allah and His***

Messenger” (Bukhari). Those who gave him vow of allegiance are the most abstinent men from worldly acquisitions and material gains and they are the people that have been praised by Allah. Both those who are special and the general public knew the abstinence of Umar and Abu Ubaidah and similar men and the spending of men of the Ansar their wealth and property in the path of Allah, such as Usaid bin Hudair, Abu Talha and Abu Ayub etc. And again after the death of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) there is no treasury from which he can give them money and there isn’t any treasury account from which he can assign to them what it contained. The Ansar are in their personal properties and likewise the Muhajirun among those who has some remnant of spoil of wars or other things of personal properties. The conduct of Abubakar and his policy in distributing property and money is leveling and equality in sharing – without giving preference to anybody – and that was the policy and conduct of Imam Ali (when he became the Caliph). So even if Ali is the one that they gave the vow of allegiance he will give them their shares the like of what Abubakar has been giving them, although his tribe is the noblest among Arab tribes and that Banu AbduMunaf are the nobles of Quraish clan and the closest Arabs to Bani Umayyah and others at that time like Abu Sufyan bin Harb and others and Bani Hashim such as Abbas and others have been with him.

Abu Sufyan and others want the Caliphate to be in the tribe of Banu Abdumunaf as was the tradition before Islam, but neither Ali nor Uthman and nor other than them listened to him due to their knowledge and religion. Therefore, which wealth or which authority did the generality of Muslims acquired due to their giving Abubakar allegiance and especially if you consider his policy of sharing property on equal basis between the grand companions (the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar) and the rest of the Muslims saying: ***“They embraced Islam for the sake of Allah and thus their reward is with Him and this property that is being distributed is nothing but provisions for sustenance.”*** He said to Umar when he advised him to make preference on sharing wealth: ***“Do I buy from them their faith?”*** Thus, the first to embrace Islam

of the Muhajirun and Ansar such as Umar, Abu Ubaidah, Usaid bin Hudair and others were leveled in receiving equal share from the state treasury, with those who entered Islam after the conquest of Makka and those who embraced Islam after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). Then, did those people gained any worldly riches through the Caliphate of Abubakar (r.a)?

Fourthly, Ahlus Sunnah with Rafidah are like Muslims with Christians because the Muslims believed that Jesus (a.s) is a slave of Allah and His Messenger, they do not go to the extreme regarding him the way the Christians do (by calling him god or son of god or one of the godhead) and they do not reject him the way Jews rejected him. Christians are claiming that he is god and they want to raise him above Muhammad, Abraham and Moses, nay they preferred his disciples above those Messengers. This is similar to the way Shia Rafidah want to prefer those who fought in the side of Ali such as Muhammad bin Abubakar, and Ashtar an-Nakh'i, over Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and the rest of the Muhajirun and Ansar. If a Muslim debate a Christian he will not be able to say anything regarding Jesus (a.s) other than the truth, but if you want to know the ignorance of a Christian assume a debate between him and a Jew. A Christian can surely not be able to answer the ambiguity of a Jew^[39] unless if he employ and use what Muslims reply them with of proofs and arguments.

If a Christian object to the Prophethood of Muhammad (s.a.w) with any objection a Jew can also use similar objection against the Prophethood of Jesus (a.s) with what is greater than that, this is because the clear proofs of the Prophethood of Muhammad (s.a.w) are greater than those of Jesus (a.s) and his affairs are more far away from ambiguity than those of Jesus (a.s). So if objecting to what has evidence greater and farther away from any ambiguity is permitted, then objecting to what is lesser than that is more deserving. If objecting to Prophethood of Jesus (a.s) is false, then objecting to Muhammad (s.a.w) more deserved to be false. If evidence that is lower in strength is affirmed, then affirming the strongest evidence is worthier.

Most of the debates between the Muslims with Christians is on this method, like the well known story of al-Qadi Abubakar al-Tayb al-Baqlani, when Muslims sent him to the King of Christians in Constantine (Istanbul), they received him well, knew his station and feared that he will not bow to their King if he entered before him. So they asked him to enter before him through a short door so that he will enter with bent body, but he understood their plan and so he entered backing. He thereby does the opposite of what they intended him to do. When he sat down, they talked to him and some of them desired to disparage Muslims, so they said to him: "What are they saying about the wife of your Prophet?" He meant by that the question of slander against Aisha which some Rafidah are still propagating. He replied them saying: "There are two women who have been accused of illegal sexual intercourse by fabricators and liars; Mary and Aisha, with regard to Mary she come carrying a child without a husband, while Aisha did not come carrying any child although she has a husband." The Christians were utterly defeated.

What his argument entailed is that the clarity of the innocence of Aisha (r.a) is greater than in the case of Mary and that ambiguity is closer to Mary than Aisha, therefore since the falsehood of those who accused Mary is maintained, then that of those who accused Aisha is more deserving to be upheld.

This is similar to holding debate between two sects with regard to the goodness that each possess over the other and the evil that each possess less than the other. So if something of the evil of a group is mentioned it will be countered that the evils of the other one are greater, like the words of Allah: **"They ask you concerning fighting in the Sacred Months (i.e. 1st, 7th, 11th and 12th months of the Islamic calendar). Say, "Fighting therein is a great (transgression) – then He added - but a greater (transgression) with Allah is to prevent mankind from following the Way of Allah, to disbelieve in Him, to prevent access to Al-Masjid-al-Haram (at Makka), and to drive out its inhabitants, and Al-Fitnah is worse than killing. And they will never cease fighting you until they turn you back from your religion (Islamic**

Monotheism) if they can. ...” (2:217). This verse was revealed when the unbelievers find fault that a Muslim battalion killed Ibn al-Khadrami in the sacred month. Allah replied that, it is surely a great thing, but what the polytheists are on of polytheism and preventing others from the path of Allah and the Sacred Mosque and expelling people from it are greater sins to Allah, for that is hindering people from that which one cannot achieve success in the Hereafter without it and also the transgression they are committing by prevent people from the Sacred Mosque is greater than committing transgression in a sacred month.

In the above example both parties has something that is censured, but in the first example all the two parties do not deserve to be censured for there is only ambiguity in the two cases and there are proofs for the two cases only that proof in one of the cases is stronger and clearer and its ambiguity is weaker and more latent and therefore deserved more to be affirmed with the truth than the one with weaker evidence and stronger ambiguity.

This is the situation of Christians and Jews with the Muslims and it is the condition of people of innovation with Ahlus Sunnah and especially Shia Rafidah. This is the state of affairs of Ahlus Sunnah with Rafidah with regard to Abubakar and Ali. Undoubtedly, a Shia Rafidi cannot be able to establish the belief of Ali, his justice, his being among the denizen of Paradise and his Caliphate, if he did not establish that for Abubakar, Umar and Uthman. Whenever he want to affirm that to Ali only he will not be aided by evidences; just like the way if a Christian want to assert the Prophethood of Jesus (a.s) and deny that of Muhammad (s.a.w) he will not be aided by proofs.

If the Kharijite who are excommunicating Ali from Islam or the Nawasib^[40] who are abusing him said to him (a Shia Rafidi) that Imam Ali has been unjust and a person who is seeking for power and authority and worldly pleasure. And that he sought the Caliphate for himself, he fought with the sword and killed for that purpose thousands of Muslims to the extent that he was unable to control the Caliphate; his companions dispersed from him, fought him and killed him. These words if they are corrupt and untruth the words of Rafidi

against Abubakar and Umar are more corrupt and untruth and if what he said concerning them are true and acceptable then this deserved to be truer and more acceptable. It is well known by both scholars and the masses (the special and the generality) that the person who people choose to lead them by their choice and pleasure, without fighting anyone with neither sword nor cane, and he did not give anyone among those who choose him and agreed upon him any money, and he did not appoint any of his relatives and progeny to position of authority, and he did not leave behind any property that belonged to the Muslims to his heirs; he has spent all his wealth in the path of Allah and did not take anything in order to recover what he has spent. Before his death, he left a will instructing that all he has left shall be taken to the Muslims treasury and he did not left anything other than an old cloth, a horse, and a slave girl.

On that account Abdurrahman bin 'Auf said to Umar when he was carrying the property that Abubakar left to the Muslim treasury: ***“Are you denying the family of Abubakar their property?”*** Umar replied him saying: ***“Abubakar uploaded these things from his neck and I will not put them on my own.”*** Abdurrahman bin 'Auf said thereafter: ***“May Allah bestows His mercy on you Abubakar, you have really placed a burden on rulers after you.”***

With all these Abubakar did not kill a Muslim to compel obedience to his authority; he did not fight a Muslim with a Muslim. Nay, he fought with Muslims those who apostate, who recanted from their religion and the unbelievers and began with them (Prophet's companions) the conquest of countries and regions (of the world) and then he left as his successor the strong, the truthful, the trustworthy, the genius Umar bin al-Khattab. Not because he is a relative of his or his kindred or for worldly benefits but as a sincere advise to Muslims and his foresight was right and his discernment applauded for through him countries were conquered, treasury records of Muslims established, the Muslims treasury was filled and justice and fairness spread all over the land. This was due to his holding strongly to guidance, his shunning worldly pleasures, and his refusal to appoint

his relative to any position of authority and then Allah sealed his life with martyrdom.

If it is permissible for a Rafidi to say that this man was seeking wealth and power. Then it is permissible for a Nasibi to say: Ali was unjust, striving after wealth and power; he fought over power and authority which led to Muslims killing each other, he did not fight the unbelievers and nothing accrued to the Muslims during his Caliphate other than evil and tribulation in their religious and worldly affairs.

If it is permissible to say that Ali was seeking the pleasure of Allah, he is not compromising in the affairs of Allah, he is exerting his efforts to do the right thing, and that shortcomings are from other than him of the companions. Or to say that he exerted his effort and he is on the right course but other than him have erred despite this situation. It will be replied that Abubakar and Umar are seeking the pleasure of Allah but Shia Rafidah do not know their rights and have erred in their censuring of them. Undoubtedly Abubakar and Umar are the farthest away from the suspicion of seeking wealth, power and authority than Imam Ali and the suspicion of Kharijites who censured Imam Ali and Uthman and excommunicated them from Islam are closer than the suspicion of Shia Rafidah who are censuring Abubakar and Umar and excommunicated them from Islam. Then, how about the Prophet's companions and Tabi'en (students of the companions who are the second generation of scholars) who refused to give Imam Ali vow of allegiance or fought him? Really, the suspicion of those people is greater than the suspicion of those who censured Abubakar, Umar and Uthman. This is because those people said: "We will not give our vow of allegiance except to a person who will do justice to us, protect us from those who are committing injustice against us and take our right from those who have committed injustice against us and if he did not do that; then he is weak and incapable of being a leader or an unjust ruler."

If the above statement is false, then the falsity of those who are saying that Abubakar and Umar have been unjust, seekers of wealth and power is clearer; this is a matter that cannot be doubted by anybody that possess knowledge and intellect. What is the suspicion

of men like Abu Musa al-Ash'ari who agreed with 'Arm bin 'As on dethroning both Ali and Mu'awiyah and made appointing of a new leader consultation between Muslims, if it is compared with the suspicion of Abdullah bin Saba and people like him who claimed that he (Ali) is infallible and that he is either a god or a prophet.

Nay, what is the suspicion of those who decided to appoint Mu'awiyah as ruler over them from the suspicion of those who said Ali is god or a prophet? Surely, the latter are unbelievers by the consensus of Muslim scholars in contrast to the former! What this matter is explaining is that Shia Rafidah cannot be able to prove the faith of Imam Ali and his justice until they follow the path of Ahlus Sunnah. If the Kharijites and other groups that excommunicated Ali from Islam or those who are calling him a transgressor, say that we did not believe that he is a believer. Nay, he is an unbeliever and an unjust person as they (Shia Rafidah) are saying concerning Abubakar and Umar! They do not have any proof about his faith and justice, but that the same proof is more applicable on Abubakar, Umar and Uthman. If they advance proof with regard to what has been concurrently reported about his embracing Islam, his immigration and his struggle in the path of Allah. Likewise narrations have been concurrently reported with regard to those people. Nay, the Islam of Mu'awiyah, Yazid and the Caliphs of Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas and their performance of prayer, fasting and their fighting unbelievers has been concurrently reported. And if Shia Rafidah claimed that any of those people is a hypocrite, the Kharijite claimed the same thing against him. If Shia Rafidah mention a suspicion, the Kharijite will mention a greater suspicion; if they (Rafidah) state what the slanderers, the liars states concerning Abubakar and Umar, that they have been hypocrites in their hearts, enemies of the Messenger of Allah and they have destroyed his religion according to their abilities. A Kharijite can be able to say something like that against Imam Ali; they can state that he has been envying his cousin (the Prophet), the enmity is within the family, he desired corrupting his religion, but he was not able to carry out his plan during the life time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the first three

Caliphs. And he plan the killing of the third Caliph, fueled tribulation, went to the extreme of killing the companions and members of his community out of hatred and enmity and that he inwardly loved the hypocrites who claimed that he is a god or a prophet, although he is displaying what is not in his heart. This is because his religion is dissimulation (Taqiyya); when he burnt them with fire he showed that he is against their beliefs but inwardly he is with them. And that is why the Batinites^[41] are among his followers; with them are his secrets and they are conveying from him the principles of their creeds. The Kharijite will say a lot of these types of things and the things that are being said by many people are greater; just like what the Rafidah are saying with regard to the three Caliphs, because the suspicion of Rafidah is more false than the suspicion of Kharijites and they are better than them in intellect and intention.

The Rafidah are the greatest liars and more corrupt in religion. If they want to prove the belief of Imam Ali and his justice with verses of the Qur'an; it will be said to them the Qur'an is general and its verses are all encompassing and there isn't a verse which they can claim has been specifically revealed concerning Ali but in like manner it can be claimed that it is also specific or another like it or better than it; to Abubakar and Umar.

The door of making claims without proof is wide open and claims made on the virtues of Abubakar and Umar can be proven more than the claims made for other than them. If they say, his virtues have been established by texts and narrations; texts and narrations with regard to those are more in number and more established and if they claimed concurrency of narrations, then concurrent narrations here are more numerous and more sound. If they rely on the narrations of the Prophets companions; the narrations of the Prophets companions with regard to the virtues of Abubakar and Umar are more in number. And then they (Rafidah) are saying that all the Prophet's companions have apostate from Islam except a few of them; then how can you accept their narrations on the virtue of anybody since among the companions there isn't enough Shia Rafidah from whom you can get concurrent narrations! Therefore,

the path to hadith science is cut up from them if they did not follow the path of Ahlus Sunnah in the like manner that the path of knowing the truth is cut up from the Christians if they did not follow the path of Muslims.

The efforts of Shia Rafidah is like the efforts of the person who want to establish understanding of religion of Abdullah bin Abbas excluding Ali's or the knowledge of 'Alqamah and Aswad excluding Ibn Mas'ud and similar matters in which a verdict is established for a thing excluding that which deserved it better. This type of contradiction can only be avoided if the path of knowledge, justice and fairness is treaded.

That is why Shia Rafidah are among the most ignorant and the most strayed of people, in the same way that the Christians are of the most ignorant people. The Shia Rafidah are among the most evil of men just as the Jews are of the most wicked and evil of people; they possessed the types of Christians ignorance and the wickedness and evil of the Jews.

Fifthly, we say: Your (Rafidi) comparing this matter with the case of Umar bin Sa'ad who stated that seeking for wealth and power is preferred over all obligations entailed that all the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar are like him and this is false. Here is his father Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas (r.a) who renounced the world; its power and authority and its wealth. When tribulation occurred, he secluded himself from people and stayed in his house at al-'Aqiq. His son (this Umar), come to him and blamed him for that conduct saying to him: "People in Madina are struggling for power and authority while you are here?" He replied him saying: ***"Go away, for I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) saying; 'Surely Allah loves of His slaves those with piety, the hidden (unknown) and the self-sufficient'" (Muslim, Ahmad).*** He said this at a time when no one remained among the Ahlul Shura (those who consulted to elect leader after Umar) but he and Imam Ali; he is the person who conquered Iraq and humiliate the army of King of Kings (the Persians) and he is the last of the ten (promised Paradise) to die.

Since it is not right to compare Umar bin Sa'ad with his father, how can he be compared with Abubakar, Umar and Uthman? Furthermore, Shia Rafidah do not compare Muhammad bin Abubakar with his father; nay they are upholding him above his father, giving him preference and loving him just because he has harmed Uthman (r.a) and because he was one of the close companions of Ali and he was raised in his house; at the same time they are cursing his father Abubakar and censuring him. So if Nawasib did similar things to Umar bin Sa'ad and praises him because he killed Husain, and because he belonged to the Shia of Uthman and he is one of those who are aiding him and abused his father Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas because he refused to fight on the side of Mu'awiyah and aid Uthman. Have they not committed the deeds of Rawafid?

Nay, the Rawafid are more evil than the Nawasib, this is because Abubakar is better than Sa'ad, and Uthman is the farthest away of those who deserved to be killed than Husain. Both of them have been wrong, treated unjustly and are martyred, and that is why the evils and corruptions that occurred in the Islamic community after killing Uthman are greater than the evils and corruptions that occurred after killing Husain.

Uthman is among the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar and he is the unjustly treated Caliph: They asked him to step down without right, but he refused to step down, and he did not fight in self-defense until he was killed. As for Husain, he was not the ruler but he is seeking for authority until he realized that it is unattainable. They asked him to submit himself so that he will be taken to Yazid as prisoner and he refused their request; he fought until he was killed unjustly, a martyr. The injustice that occurred to Uthman is greater and his patience and perseverance was more perfect; both of them are treated unjustly and martyrs. If anybody compared the ways Imam Ali and Husain sought the Caliphate with the way the leaders of Isma'iliyyah sect of the Shia sought for power – such as al-Hakim and his like – and say; surely Ali and Husain has been unjust, seeking for authority without right, just like al-Hakim and his like of

the Kings of Bani 'Ubaid; such a person must be a liar, a fabricator in making such a comparison. This is because the Islam and faith of Ali and Husain are established so also their virtues and outstanding traits in contrast of the hypocrisy and atheism of those people. Therefore, whoever compared Husain and Imam Ali with what has been committed by some Talibiyyun (they are a group of Shia who claimed the caliphate for the descendants of 'Abu Talib, rather than those of Abbas) and people who are similar to them (in seeking power by force) in the Arabian Peninsula or in the East or in the West; seeking for power without right and committing injustice against people in their properties and persons must be an unjust liar!!! And the person who compared Abubakar and Umar to Umar bin Sa'ad deserved more to be a liar and an unjust person. The extreme state that is being shown by Umar bin Sa'ad and those who are similar to him is their confession that they sought for the world through disobedience to Allah; and many Muslims commit this type of sin.

With regard to Shia, many of them confessed that they sought power and authority in order to corrupt and destroy Islam and out of hatred of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). These facts are known from the speeches of Batinites and similar groups of the Shia; they used to confessed that in reality they do not profess Islam, but they are only feigning Shia creed due to the low intellect of the Shia adherents and their ignorance and so that they can achieve their aims through them. The first of those, nay the best of them is al-Mukhtar bin Abi Ubaid the liar; he was the leader of Shia, he killed Abdullah bin Ziyad, he claimed that he is seeking vengeance for Husain and killed the people who killed him. He then sought nearness to Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah and progeny of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), thereafter he claimed Prophethood, and that Angel Gabriel is coming to him with revelations. It was recorded in Sahih Muslim that the Messenger of Allah said: ***"...in Thaqif, there would be born a great liar and great murderer"* (Muslim)**. The liar was Mukhtar bin Abi Ubaid and the Murderer was Hajjaj bin Yusuf ath-Thaqafi. It is well known that Umar bin Sa'ad the leader of the army that killed

Husain (r.a), although he is unjust and he has preferred the world over religion; his sin is not as grievous as that of Mukhtar bin Abi Ubaid who claimed that he is seeking revenge for Imam Husain and he killed those who killed him. Nay, this Rafidi has committed greater lie and sin against Allah than Umar bin Sa'ad.^[42]

Therefore, this Shia adherent (Mukhtar bin Abi Ubaid) is worse than that Nasibi (Umar bin Sa'ad). Nay, Hajjaj bin Yusuf is better than Mukhtar, because Hajjaj is a murderer as he was named by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); he used to kill people without right, while Mukhtar is a liar who is claiming that Allah sent revelation to him and that Angel Gabriel used to come to him and this sin is greater than killing people because this is unbelief and if he did not repent from it he is an apostate and putting people into tribulation (doubt with regarding their religion) in greater than killing them.^[43]

This is a general rule: You will never find anyone among those who Shia Rafidah censured by right or in falsehood except that you find among them someone who is more evil than him. And you will never find anybody among those who Shia are praising but that you will find among those who the Kharijites are praises somebody who is better than him. Surely, Rawafid are more evil than Nawasib and those who Rawafid are excommunicating from Islam and calling them transgressors are better than those who are being excommunicated from Islam and called transgressors by Nawasib.

With regard to Ahlus Sunnah; they undoubtedly love and befriend all believers and always speak with knowledge and justice. They are neither of the people of ignorance nor of the people of vain desires. They are free and absolved from all the paths of Rawafid and Nawasib. They love, aid and befriend all the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar. They knew the estimations, virtues and outstanding acts and traits of all the Prophet's companions, they heed, observe and respect rights of the family of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) which have been laid down for them by Allah. Furthermore, Ahlus Sunnah neither agree with what Mukhtar and other liars committed nor with what Hajjaj bin Yusuf and other unjust rulers committed of injustice.

Ahlus Sunnah also knew the grades and positions of the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar; so they knew that Abubakar and Umar have precedence and virtues that are not shared with anybody among the Prophet's companions; neither Uthman nor Ali nor anybody else (r.a). This affair was agreed upon in the best century, the first century of Islam excepting some lone opinion that is inconsequential. The first Shia, who have been companions of Imam Ali do not use to have any doubt with regard to the preference and precedence of Abubakar and Umar (r.a) over him. Why not, when it has been concurrently narrated from him stating that the best of this nation after its Prophet is Abubakar and Umar, but there is a group of Shia^[44] who give precedence to him over Uthman, but this issue is more latent from the former. This is why the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah agreed upon the precedence of Abubakar and Umar (over Ali and the rest of the companions), as it is recorded from the schools of jurisprudence, such as Abu Hanifa, Shafi'i, Malik, Ahmad bin Hanbal, ath-Tahauri, al-Auza'i, Laith bin Sa'ad and all Muslim scholars of the science of Hadith, the ascetics, and scholars of Tafsir (exegesis of the Qur'an) of the past and the present. With regard to Uthman and Imam Ali; a group of the scholars of Madina use to keep quiet concerning them (without mentioning one precede the other) and this is one of the opinions of Sufyan ath-Thauri, and then it was related that he has abandoned that opinion when he met Ayub al-Sakhtiyani who said to him: "Whoever give precedence to Ali over Uthman has belittled and ridiculed the Muhajirun and Ansar." The generality of Ahlus Sunnah scholars give precedence to Uthman over Ali and this opinion is supported by texts (Qur'an and hadith), consensus of scholars and evaluation of fair minded people. What is being narrated that some scholars of the past gives precedence to Ja'afar or Talha and the like are with regard to some specific issues and not general superiority and the same verdict is applied on what some of them said in relation to Imam Ali (r.a).

With regard to what the Rafidi stated: "Some of them become confused concerning the true affair, therefore when he saw the one

seeking for the world he supported his leadership; he failed in his evaluation and thus deserved censure of Allah. Some of them supported him due to his short sightedness and because he saw a large crowd, he gave his allegiance thinking that a large crowd means being right thereby forgetting the words of Allah: “... **And they are a few...**” (38:24). And: “...**But few of My slaves are grateful...**” (34:13).”

It will be said to this liar; who made the companions that gave Abubakar vows of allegiance into three different groups: Most of them sought for the world, some failed in their evaluation and other just follow the majority without making any evaluation. It is well known that evil occurs either due to corrupt intension or due to ignorance and ignorance occurs due to either neglecting evaluation or failing to evaluate. He (the Rafidi) mentioned that there are among the Prophet's companions (r.a) who gave vow of allegiance to Abubakar (r.a), those who failed to evaluate, assess and search for the truth and if they have searched for the truth they would have known it. These types of people are blamed for failing to seek for the truth and because they have abandoned the necessary search for the truth. He then mentioned that there are those who imitated the majority by giving vow of allegiance to Abubakar. The Rafidi means that these are the reasons for giving vow of allegiance to Abubakar (r.a).

We say to him that all these are liars that can be uttered by anybody and Rafida are liars and if we asked this fabricator, slanderer to advance a proof for what he has said he will not be able to offer any. Allah the Most High has forbidden speaking without knowledge, then how about if the reality is contrary to what he stated? If we do not know the conditions of the Prophet's companions, it is forbidden to witness against them with what we do not know concerning corruption of intent. Allah the Exalted said: “**And follow not (O man i.e., say not, or do not or witness not, etc.) that of which you have no knowledge (e.g. one's saying: "I have seen," while in fact he has not seen, or "I have heard," while he has not heard).** Verily! The hearing, and the sight, and the heart, of each of

those you will be questioned (by Allah)” (17:36). In another verse Allah said: **“Verily, you are those who have disputed about that of which you have knowledge. Why do you then dispute concerning that which you have no knowledge? It is Allah Who knows, and you know not” (3:60).** How can we accept this Rafidi’s thesis concerning the Prophet’s companions after we knew that they are the best of the Islamic community in terms of knowledge, religion, and intellect! Abdullah bin Mas’ud (r.a) said concerning them: ***“Whoever want to follow the footsteps of someone he shall follow the footsteps of those who are dead because the living may fall into tribulation (Fitnah). Those are the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w), they were by Allah the best of this nation, they possess the most sound and innocent hearts, the most deepest knowledge, they are not fabricators neither pretenders; they are people who have been chosen by Allah to accompany His Messenger and establishing His religion. Therefore know their virtues and follow them in their footsteps and hold firmly to whatever you can be able to of their conducts and religious practices for they are on the right guidance” (Musnad Imam Ahmad).*** In another narration Abdullah bin Mas’ud (r.a) said: ***“Undoubtedly Allah searched the hearts of His slaves and selected that of Muhammad (s.a.w) for Himself because it is the best of hearts and He sent him with His message. He again searched the hearts of His slaves and chose his companions because they possessed the best hearts and He made them the aids of His Messenger; they fight for His religion. Therefore, whatever the Muslims see as good is good in the estimation of Allah and whatever the Muslims see as bad is bad in the estimation of Allah” (Musnad Ahmad).***

In another narration that is related to the above, Abdullah bin Mas’ud (r.a) said: ***“All the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) agreed on appointing Abubakar (as the successor of the Messenger of Allah).”*** The words of Ibn Mas’ud concerning the Prophet’s companions that: ***“They possess the most sound and innocent hearts, the deepest knowledge and they are neither***

fabricators nor pretenders,” is a comprehensive statement in which he explained their sound objective and good intentions; their hearts are innocent and thereby devoid of evil intents, they have perfect knowledge and deep sound comprehension, and they are neither fabricators nor are they pretenders. All his words have contradicted the submissions of this Rafidi, the liar who described most of them as seekers of the world and some of them with ignorance either due to their failure (to learn) or due to negligence. What Abdullah bin Mas’ud said is the truth because they are the best of this community as concurrent, sound hadiths have come from the Messenger of Allah in which he said: ***“The best periods is the period in which I am sent, and then the one that come after it and then the one that come after it.”*** They are the Wasat (just) community (and the best) nation, that will be witnesses over mankind, and who Allah has guided to that which people (the past communities) have differed of the truth by His Will and Allah guides whoever He likes to the straight path. They are not of those who earned Allah’s anger by following their vain desires and they are not of those who went astray due to their ignorance as those fabricators of lies grouped them into following vain desires and ignorance; nay they have the perfect good intention and the most perfect knowledge.

If that is not so, it will entail that this community is not the best community and they are not the best of this community and both assertions contradicted the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w). Intellectual reasoning has proved what have been stated for if one ponder over the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) and ponder over the conditions of the Jews, the Christians, the Sabians,^[45] the Magians^[46] and the polytheists, he will come to understand the virtues of this community over all other communities of the world in beneficial knowledge and righteous deeds – this space will not be able to contain details of all these.

The Prophet’s companions are the best and the most perfect of this community in knowledge and good deeds as has been proven by the Qur’an, the Sunnah, consensus of the Muslims scholars and fair

evaluation and for these reason you will never find anybody among the distinguished personalities of the Islamic community who do not acknowledge and confess the merits of the Prophet's companions over him and over those who are similar to him. You will also find those who are disagreeing with that – such as the Shia Rafidah - are the most ignorant people; for this reason you will never find among the jurists consults (scholars of jurisprudence to who people refer for knowledge) any Rafidi and neither among the scholars of hadith, or among the devout scholars or the ascetics. You will also never find any Rafidi as commander of an Islamic army with whom Muslims army attain victory (over the enemies of Islam) and neither will you find any Rafidi ruler or king who aided Islam, establish it and fought enemies of Islam. You will not even find among those who have been Prime Ministers among the Rawafid who has left any good legacy or good conduct.

The areas in which you find Rawafid the most are among the Zanadiqah (plural of Zindiq, see Zandaqa in footnote 18), the atheists and the hypocrites or among the ignorant who possess neither knowledge of religious texts (Qur'an and Sunnah) nor that of logic (intellectual reasoning). They grew up in villages and on mountains and became arrogant and haughty against the Muslims, they never sat before men of religion and knowledge. They follow people of vain desires who have acquired through that some wealth and power or an ancestry to which they displays partisanship as is done by the people of ignorance (savage, uncultured people). You will find the beginning of Shia Rafidah in the most evil of sects such as Isma'iliyyah, Nusairiyyah, the atheists Turqiyyah (dervish orders) and they possess liars, deceptions, betrayals and none fulfillment of vows and agreements which showed that they are hypocrites. The Messenger of Allah said: ***“Three are the signs of a hypocrite: when he spoke he told a lie, when he made a promise he acted treacherously against it, when he was trusted he betrayed” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** In a version recorded in Muslim the following sentence is added: ***“even if he observed fast and prayed and asserted that he was a Muslim.”*** The above three traits are found

among the Shia Rafidah more than in any sect that ascribe itself to Islam.

Furthermore, it will be said to this liar (the Rafidi): Let us assume that the people who gave vow of allegiance to Abubakar are as you have mentioned; either those who seek for the world or the ignorant. There come after those men in different periods of the Islamic community men who everybody attested that they are virtuous and men of knowledge. Such as Sa'id bin Musayyib, Hasan al-Basri, 'Ata bin Abi Rabah, Ibrahim an-Nakh'i, Alqamah, al-Aswad, 'Ubaidah al-Salmani, Tawus, Mujahid, Sa'id bin Jubair, Abi Shi'ta'a Jabir bin Zaid, Ali bin Zaid, Ali bin Husain, "Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin 'Atbah, 'Urwah bin Zubair, Qasim bin Muhammad bin Abubakar, Abibakar bin Abdurrahman bin Harth bin Hashim, Mutrif bin Shakheir, Muhammad bin Was'i, Habib al-'Ajmi, Malik bin Dinar, Makhul, Hakm bin 'Atbah, Yazid bin Abi Habib, and a lot of others that can only be numbered by Allah.

After the above (sample of students of the Prophet's companions) there come Ayyub as-Sakhtiyani, Abdullah bin'Aun, Yunus bin 'Ubaid, Ja'afar bin Muhammad, al-Zuhri, 'Amr bin Dinar, Yahaya bin Sa'id al-Ansari, Rabi'ah bin Abi Abdurrahman, Abu Zaiyad, Yahaya bin Abi Kathir, Qaradah, Mansur bin Mu'atamar, al-A'Amash, Hammad bin Abi Sulaiman, Hisham al-Dustawi, and Sa'id bin Abi 'Urubah.

After those people we have scholars such as Malik bin Anas, Hammad bin Zaid, Hammad bin Salma, al-Laith bin Sa'ad, al-'Auza'i, Abu Hanifa, Ibn Abi Lailah, Shuraikh, Ibn Abi Zi'ib, and Ibn Majishun.

After them there come scholars such as Yahaya bin Sa'id al-Qahtan, Abdurrahman bin Mahdi, Waki'i bin Jarrah, Abdurrahman bin Qasim, Ashhab bin Abdulaziz, Abi Yusuf, Muhammad bin al-Hasan, al-Shafi'i, Ahmad bin Hambal, Ishaq bin Rahwiyyah, Abi 'Ubaid, and Abi Thaur etc. (only Allah can be able to count all of them). All those men have no goal for wealth or for power in giving precedence to the one who does not deserve it. Those are scholars who are among the greatest men in evaluating knowledge and discerning the truth; and all of them have agreed upon the precedence of Abubakar and Umar

(r.a). Nay, the first Shia who have been at the time of Ali (r.a) used to mention the precedence and superiority of Abubakar and Umar. Al-Qasim said: "I asked Imam Malik concerning Abubakar and Umar." He replied: "I did not see anybody among those who I emulate doubting there precedence." He means there precedence over Uthman and Ali and by this he is reporting the consensus of the people of Madina on the issue. It is well known that people of Madina do not support Bani Umayyah like people of Syria for they even rebelled against Yazid and he fought them at al-Harrah, and at that battle what happened (of atrocities) took place. Furthermore, none among the people of Madina fought Ali as he was fought by the people of Basra and the people of Syria; the people of Madina used to consider Imam Ali (r.a) as one of their scholars up to the time when he left it for Iraq, but they all agreed upon the superiority of Abubakar and Umar over him.

Baihaqi narrated on the authority of Imam Shafi'i who said: "The Prophet's companions and their students (the Tabiein) did not disagree on the precedence of Abubakar and Umar." Shuraik bin Abi Namr was asked: "Who is superior Abubakar or Ali?" He replied: "Abubakar." The questioner said to him: "You are saying this and you are a Shia?" He replied: "Yes, the real Shia is the one who say this, I swear by Allah (I saw) Imam Ali mounted this pulpit and said: ***"You shall all hear this, surely the best of this community after its Messenger is Abubakar and then Umar."*** Then he continued: "Can we reject his words? Can we call him a liar? I swear by Allah he is not a liar."

How then is it possible for anybody – with all these proofs – say that the people who gave him their vow of allegiance are seeking for the world or they are ignorant!! This description suited the Shia Rafidah; for you will never find among those who call themselves Muslims a sect more ignorant and greedier in acquisition of worldly material than Rafidah. I have studied them and found that all the defects they are ascribing to the Prophet's companions suited them the most while the companions are farthest away from those defects. The Shia Rafidah undoubtedly are the greatest liars, like Musailamah the

liar for he said: “I am a sincere Prophet,” and that is why they characterized themselves with faith and characterized the companions with hypocrisy; while they are the greatest of all people in hypocrisy and the companions are the greatest of all people in faith.

The Rafidi said: “Some of them sought for the Caliphate by right and he was given the vow of allegiance by a few people who turned away from the life of this world and its enticements. They do not mind in the course of Allah the blame of the blamer but rather they were sincere and they followed what they are commanded by obeying the one who deserved to be appointed. Since this calamity has befallen the Muslims, it is necessary for each Muslim to search for the truth and stand firm on justice; place the truth on its rightful place and not commit injustice on the one who deserved the Caliphate. Allah has said: ‘... **The curse of Allah is upon the oppressors**’” (11:18).

We reply him saying, firstly: It would have been necessary for him (the Rafidi) to say: When a group holds this opinion and another group held that opinion it would have been imperative to search and find out which of the two opinions is more right. If one group agreed to follow the truth and the other accepted falsehood; if such a situation has occurred there is need for evaluation and if it has not occurred then there is no need for mentioning it for it has not occurred.

Secondly: Your statement that he has sought for the Caliphate for himself and he was giving vow of allegiance by a minority, is lie against Imam Ali, because he never sought for the Caliphate during the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman. He only sought for it after the murder of Uthman and at that time most of the people are with him and not a minority. Both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia have agreed that Imam Ali never demanded to be given the vow of allegiance during the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and nobody gave him allegiance as a Caliph.^[47] Nonetheless, Shia Rafidah are claiming that he sought for the Caliphate and they believed that he deserved to be the leader but he was unable to

attain it. If their words are true they are not beneficial to them because he did not sought to be the Caliph and nobody followed him on that course; then how about if it is a lie? His (the Rafidi) words that Imam Ali was given vow of allegiance by a minority is a lie against the companions because nobody among them swore allegiance to him during the reign of the first three Caliphs and nobody can claim that (with authority). The extreme statement that one can make is that there are among them those who want to swear allegiance to him. We knew that when Imam Ali became the Caliph many people loved to choose Mu'awiyah or other than them. When Uthman was given the vow of allegiance there is in the hearts of some people inclination towards other than him. So this type of situation cannot be dismissed from existence.

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) was in Madina and within it and its surroundings there are hypocrites as Allah has said: **“And among the Bedouins round about you, some are hypocrites, and so are some among the people of Madina, they exaggerate and persist in hypocrisy, you (O Muhammad SAW) know them not, We know them. We shall punish them twice, and thereafter they shall be brought back to a great (horrible) torment” (9:101).** Allah the Exalted has said concerning the polytheists: **“And they say: "Why is not this Quran sent down to some great man of the two towns (Makka and Ta'if)?" (43:31).** They loved that the Qur'an is revealed to someone who they respect among the citizens of either Makka or Ta'if. Allah said in reply to them: **“Is it they who would portion out the Mercy of your Lord? It is We Who portion out between them their livelihood in this world, and We raised some of them above others in ranks, so that some may employ others in their work. But the Mercy (Paradise) of your Lord (O Muhammad SAW) is better than the (wealth of this world) which they amass” (43:32).**

His (the Rafidi) descriptions that those people have turned away from the life of this world and its enticements and that they do not mind in the course of Allah the blame of the blamer, is a clear great lie because asceticism, abstinence and fighting in the course of Allah

is not seen much among the Rawafid. The rebellious, Kharijites display more asceticism and abstinence and are greater fighters than Shia Rafidah; they displayed more fighting tenacity and their feats against the armies of Banu Umayyah and Bani Abbas are well known. This, while the Shia Rafidah are always defeated, subdued and humiliated and their love for the world and desire for life is apparent. When they wrote to Imam Husain (r.a) he sent his cousin to them and when he went to them by himself they betrayed him; sold their Hereafter for this world, deliver him to his enemies, fought him beside his enemy (and one of them killed him). So what abstinence do those people possess and what fighting in the way of Allah did they undertake?

Imam Ali (r.a) has suffered from the Shia too much to the extent of praying against them saying: ***“O’ my Allah they are disgusted of me and I am disgusted of them. They are weary of me and I am weary of them. Change them for me with better ones and change me for them with worse one.”***^[48] They have been cheating and betraying him and writing support letters to those who are fighting him. They used to betray him if he give them position of authority or he entrusted them with money; and these are their conducts before they become Rafidah (then, how about after they become Rawafid?). they were called Shia (party) of Ali when people became divided into two; a group followed those who want to avenge murder of Uthman (party of Uthman) and a group followed Imam Ali (party of Ali); those are the best Shia and yet they mistreated Imam Ali and his sons Hasan and Husain with their evil conducts. Shia are the quickest people to succumb to the blame of the blamers and the quickest people to arouse crisis, upheaval, turmoil and disturbances and the most weak of all people in facing it. They deceive whoever they showed that they are with him and are aiding him among the Prophet’s family and progeny and when he accepted them after being sure of their promises, there come who will blame them and they will betray him, turn their backs on him, deliver him to the enemies and prefer the world over him. This is the reason why sensible Muslims such as Abdullah bin Abbas, Abdullah bin Umar,

Abibakar bin Abdurrahman bin Harith bin Hisham and others advised Imam Husain, warned him and counseled him not to go to them because they knew that they will abandon him; that they will not aid him, and they will not fulfill the undertakings and the promises that they made in their letters to him. What happened is as those people have stated. The supplications of Umar bin Khattab (against people of Iraq) and the supplications of Imam Ali (against the Shia) was accepted by Allah, for He placed over them Hajjaj bin Yusuf, who do not accept goodness from the good ones among them and he do not forgive the bad ones among them. Evils of Shia spread to those who are not among them until their evils become widespread. Before us are books written by Muslims scholars on ascetics of the Islamic community and we did not find the name of any Rafidi in it.

Shia Rafidah are of the species of hypocrites and their creed is dissimulation (Taqiyyah). Is this then the condition (and attitude) of the person who is not bothered with the blame of the blamer, for Allah's sake? In fact this is the description of those who Allah the Most High has described in His Book where He stated: **"O you who believe! Whoever from among you turns back from his religion (Islam), Allah will bring a people whom He will love and they will love Him; humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is AllSufficient for His creatures' needs, AllKnower"** (5:54). Now this is the description, attitude and condition of those who fight apostates and the first to do so was Abubakar as-Siddiq and those who followed his example to the Last Day; they are the people who fought apostates such as Musailamah the liar and those who refused to pay Zakkat etc. and they are the people who conquered nations and defeated Persians and Romans and they have been the most ascetics of all people. Abdullah bin Mas'ud said concerning them: ***"You prayed and fast more than the companions of Muhammad but they are better than you."*** He was asked: ***"Why O Abu Abdurrahman?"*** He replied: ***"Because they shunned the world more than you and***

they covet the Hereafter more than you.” Those are the people who are not bothered by the blame of the blamers in the path of Allah, in contrast to Shia Rafidah who feared more than anybody the blame of the blamers. They are as Allah has said: **“And when you look at them, their bodies please you; and when they speak, you listen to their words. They are as blocks of wood propped up. They think that every cry is against them. They are the enemies, so beware of them. May Allah curse them! How are they denying (or deviating from) the Right Path” (63:4).** They will never live among the Muslims but like the Jews among all other faiths.

Then we ask: Who are those people who shunned the world and are not bothered by blame of the blamers in the path of Allah who did not swear allegiance to Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and swore allegiance to Ali? It is well known that during the reign of the first three Caliphs nobody shunned giving allegiance to them, openly opposing them and swore allegiance to Ali. Nay all of them have sworn allegiance to them and the extreme statement that can be made is that there may be some people who are hiding in their hearts preference for Ali and this cannot be considered a condition of the one who is not bothered with the blame of the blamers in the path of Allah.

During the reign of Ali (r.a), he censured and disparaged the Shia for hindering him from fighting in the way of Allah, their slackness to fight, evasiveness, laziness and laxity. Therefore, where are those who are not bothered by the blame of the blamers among those Shia?^[49] If Shia lied against some companions such as Abu Dhar, Salman (was the governor of Mada'in for Umar) and 'Ammar (was the governor of Kufa for Umar) etc., it is well known from concurrent traditions that those people are among the greatest men that respect, honor and follow Abubakar and Umar (r.a). We will discuss latter on what happened to Uthman (r.a).

During the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (r.a) there is nobody that is called Shia and the name Shia is to affiliated or ascribed to anybody; neither Uthman nor Ali or any other person.

When Uthman was killed the Muslims become divided, some of them inclined towards Uthman (they want to avenge his murder) and another group inclined towards Ali (r.a) and the two parties fought and at that moment the Shia of Uthman fought the Shia of Ali. In Sahih Muslim Sa'ad bin Hisham bin ***'Amir decided to participate in the expedition for the sake of Allah, so he came to Madina and he decided to dispose of his property there and buy arms and horses instead and fight against the Romans to the end of his life. When he came to Madina, he met the people of Madina. They dissuaded him to do such a thing, and informed him that a group of six men had decided to do so during the lifetime of the Apostle of Allah (s.a.w) and the Apostle of Allah (may peace be upon him) forbade them to do it, and said: Is there not for you a model pattern in me? And when they narrated this to him (Sa'ad bin Hisham), he returned to his wife, though he had divorced her and made (people) witness to his reconciliation. He then came to Ibn 'Abbas and asked him about the Witr of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him). Ibn 'Abbas said: Should I not lead you to one who knows best amongst the people of the world about the Witr of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him)? He said: Who is it? He (Ibn 'Abbas) said: It is 'Aisha. So go to her and ask her (about Witr) and then come to me and inform me about her answer that she would give you. So I came to Hakim bin Aflah and requested him to take me to her. He said: I would not go to her, for I forbade her to speak anything (about the conflict) between the two Shias (groups or parties), but she refused (to accept my advice) and went (to participate in that conflict). I (requested) him (Hakim) with an oath to lead me to her. So we went to 'Aisha and we begged permission to meet her. She granted us permission and we went in ...)*** (Muslim). Mu'awiyah asked Ibn Abbas: ***"Are you on the path of Ali?" He replied: "I am not. I am neither on the path of Ali nor that of Uthman; I am on the path of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)."***

Those who are in the Shia (party or group) of Ali (r.a) used to give precedence and preference to Abubakar and Umar and they differed over the precedence of Uthman over Ali. At that time nobody is called Shia Imamiyya or Shia Rafidah; they stated to be called Rafidah and become Rafidah when Zaid bin Ali bin Husain rebelled at Kufa, during the Caliphate of Hisham bin Abdulmalik. And the Shia asked him his opinion about Abubakar and Umar and he sought Allah's forgiveness for them; they outright rejected him (and abandoned him). He said to them: "You have rejected me! You have rejected me (رفضتموني)!!" from that moment they were called rejecters (Rafidah رافضة). Another group of the Shia followed him and aided him and from that moment they were called Zaidiyyah, because they are affiliated to him. From that moment Shia become divided into Imamiyyah and Zaidiyyah and whenever they increase in innovation they increase in evil. Shia Zaidiyyah are better than Rafidah in knowledge, truthfulness, shunning the world and braver.

After Abubakar, it is Umar bin Khattab (r.a) who is not bothered with the blame of the blamer and the most abstinent and austere of all of them by the consensus of all men of knowledge. The only friend of Umar (r.a) is the truth. We (Ahlus Sunnah) do not claim infallibility to any group of people, but we assert that they will never agree on misguidance and that in each issue which Ahlus Sunnah differed with Shia Rafidah the truth is with Ahlus Sunnah. And in whichever issue the Shia Rafidah are correct, you will find a group of Ahlus Sunnah agreeing with them on it. Whenever Shia Rafidah has an issue in which nobody agree with them among the groups of Ahlus Sunnah, you will find that they have erred in it i.e. the Imamah of the twelve Imams and their infallibility.

SEGMENT: ON INFALLIBILITY OF PROPHETS AND IMAMS

The Rafidi stated: All sects other than Imamiyyah and Isma'iliyyah believed that Prophets and Imams are not infallible, thus they legalized sending (as Prophets) he who can lie, forget, commit mistake and steal. Who then can accept their words among the generality of the people and how can people believe in them; how can one envisage obeying the one who what he is teaching and conveying might possibly be a mistake? They did not confine the number of Imams to a particular numbers, nay whoever give allegiance to a man from the Quraish clan of the Arabs his Caliphate is established and his obedience is obligatory on all people, even if his characters are unknown and even if he has gone to the extreme in disbelief, profligacy and hypocrisy.

We say: Reply to the above are from many directions:

Firstly, what you have mentioned with regard to the generality of the Muslims that they are negating infallibility from Prophets and that they believe that Prophets can lie, steal, and convey mistakes is a lie against them. Generality of the Muslims have agreed that Prophets are infallible in conveying message of their Lord and that no mistake shall enter any part of the conveyed laws; they must be obeyed in whatever they conveyed from their Lord regarding obligations and commands; doing the allowed and shunning the forbidden by consensus of all Muslims. They must be trusted in whatever they say by the consensus of all Muslims. They must be obeyed in what they permitted and what they disallowed by the consensus of all sects of the Islamic community except a group among the Kharijites who said: The Messenger of Allah is infallible in what he conveyed from Allah, but he is not infallible in what he commands to do or to shun. Those people are astray by the consensus of Ahlus Sunnah.

We have already mentioned that if there is anybody among the Muslims who make a wrong statement; that cannot be considered a defect in all the Muslims. And if the matter is like that then the mistakes of Rafidah are impairments in the religion of Islam, this is

because there isn't any know sect that is greater than them in lies and mistakes, but that do not impair Muslims in anything. Likewise, the existences of another mistake maker (among the sects that affiliate themselves to Islam) do not impair Islam.

Most of the people – or many of them – say that Prophets cannot commit major sins and the generality of Muslims who are saying that it is possible for them to commit minor sins – and those who are saying that they can commit major sins – are saying: That they will be corrected by Allah and they acquire by repenting from it a greater station (in the estimation of Allah) than the one on which they been.

Summarily, nobody in the Islamic community is saying that it is compulsory to obey a Prophet while it is possible that what he is conveying is a mistake. Nay, they have all agreed that whatever is obeyed by obligation shall only be the right thing. Concerning words of the Rafidi: "How can one envisage obeying the one who what he is teaching and conveying might possibly be a mistake?" We reply that: This is a matter that has not been obligated by anybody in the Islamic community!

With regard to the possibility of the Prophets making mistakes in their personal judgments, there are two known opinions among Muslims scholars; they have all agreed that they will not be affirmed in it (they will be corrected by Allah), and they are obeyed in which they are affirmed by revelation, not in what Allah has changed and forbidden and He did not command obedience in it.

With regard to the infallibility of Imams, nobody stated it except – as he has said – Imamiyyah and Isma'iliyyah. Therefore, you shall shun a statement in which nobody agree with them other than the hypocrites, the atheists whose grand scholars disbelieved more than the Jews, the Christian and the polytheists. This is always the conduct of Rafidah they shun the Muslims and take hold of the Jews, the Christians and polytheists in their words, love, aid, and fighting together etc.

Is there any people that are more astray than those who took the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar as enemies and take as their lovers and aids unbelievers and hypocrites? Allah the

Exalted has said: **“Have you (O Muhammad) not seen those (hypocrites) who take for friends a people upon whom is the Wrath of Allah (i.e. Jews)? They are neither of you (Muslims) nor of them (Jews), and they swear to a lie while they know. Allah has prepared for them a severe torment. Evil indeed is that which they used to do. Allah has prepared for them a severe torment. Evil indeed is that which they used to do. They have made their oaths a screen (for their evil actions). Thus they hinder (men) from the Path of Allah, so they shall have a humiliating torment. Their children and their wealth will avail them nothing against Allah. They will be (the) dwellers of the Fire, to dwell therein forever. On the Day when Allah will resurrect them all together (for their account), then they will swear to Him as they swear to you (O Muslims). And they think that they have something (to stand upon). Verily, they are liars! Shaitan (Satan) has overtaken them. So he has made them forget the remembrance of Allah. They are the party of Shaitan (Satan). Verily, it is the party of Shaitan (Satan) that will be the losers! Those who oppose Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad SAW), they will be among the lowest (most humiliated). Allah has decreed: "Verily! It is I and My Messengers who shall be the victorious." Verily, Allah is All-Powerful, All-Mighty. You (O Muhammad SAW) will not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, making friendship with those who oppose Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad), even though they were their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred (people). For such He has written Faith in their hearts, and strengthened them with Ruh (proofs, light and true guidance) from Himself. And We will admit them to Gardens (Paradise) under which rivers flow, to dwell therein (forever). Allah is pleased with them, and they with Him. They are the Party of Allah. Verily, it is the Party of Allah that will be the successful” (58:14-22).**

The above verses were revealed concerning the hypocrites and you will not find hypocrites in any sect more than among Shia Rafidah to

the extent that there is nobody among them but he possess a branch of hypocrisy. The Messenger of Allah said: ***“Whoever has the following four (characteristics) will be a pure hypocrite and whoever has one of the following four characteristics will have one characteristic of hypocrisy unless and until he gives it up. 1. Whenever he is entrusted, he betrays. 2. Whenever he speaks, he tells a lie. 3. Whenever he makes a covenant, he proves treacherous. 4. Whenever he quarrels, he behaves in a very imprudent, evil and insulting manner” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

Allah the Sublime said: ***“You see many of them taking the disbelievers as their Auliya' (protectors and helpers). Evil indeed is that which their ownelves have sent forward before them, for that (reason) Allah's Wrath fell upon them and in torment they will abide. And had they believed in Allah, and in the Prophet (Muhammad SAW) and in what has been revealed to him, never would they have taken them (the disbelievers) as Auliya' (protectors and helpers), but many of them are the Fasiqun (rebellious, disobedient to Allah)” (5:79-80).*** And Allah the Most High said: ***“Those among the Children of Israel who disbelieved were cursed by the tongue of David and Jesus, son of Mary. That was because they disobeyed (Allah and the Messengers) and were ever transgressing beyond bounds. They used not to forbid one another from the Munkar (wrong, evildoing, sins, polytheism, disbelief, etc.) which they committed. Vile indeed was what they used to do. You see many of them taking the disbelievers as their Auliya' (protectors and helpers). Evil indeed is that which their ownelves have sent forward before them, for that (reason) Allah's Wrath fell upon them and in torment they will abide. And had they believed in Allah, and in the Prophet (Muhammad SAW) and in what has been revealed to him, never would they have taken them (the disbelievers) as Auliya' (protectors and helpers), but many of them are the Fasiqun (rebellious, disobedient to Allah) (5:78-81).*** Shia Rafidah most of the times do not forbid one another from committing wrong and transgression, nay they commit it. Their

countries (and cities) are the greatest of all lands in committing detestable things such as transgressions, injustice, evils and profligacies etc. They also befriend unbelievers whom Allah is angry with, so they are not of the believers and they are not of the unbelievers. Allah the Most High said: **“Have you (O Muhammad) not seen those (hypocrites) who take for friends a people upon whom is the Wrath of Allah (i.e. Jews)? They are neither of you (Muslims) nor of them (Jews), and they swear to a lie while they know” (58:14).** This is why they are another specie (another kind of people) in the estimation of the generality of Muslims. When Muslims fought them on the mountain they were living on and committing injustice and transgression along the seashores of Syria; they used to kill people, take their properties, and committing highway robbery believing that it is permissible for them to do so and by doing it they are worshipping Allah.^[50] When they were fought by some Muslims among the Turkman, they stated shouting that they are Muslims and the Turkman replied them saying: “No you are another type of people outside the fold of Islam.” Allah the Exalted said: **“... they swear to a lie while they know” (58:14).** Now this is the habit and conduct of Rafidah. Allah said: **“They have made their oaths a screen (for their evil actions). Thus they hinder (men) from the Path of Allah, so they shall have a humiliating torment,”** – to the words of Allah – **“You (O Muhammad) will not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, making friendship with those who oppose Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad), even though they were their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred (people). For such He has written Faith in their hearts, and strengthened them with Ruh (proofs, light and true guidance) from Himself. And We will admit them to Gardens (Paradise) under which rivers flow, to dwell therein (forever). Allah is pleased with them, and they with Him. They are the Party of Allah. Verily, it is the Party of Allah that will be the successful” (58:16-22).** Most of them love unbeliever in their hearts more than they love the believers. And this is why when the polytheists, unbelievers Turks (Mongols and Tatars) come from the

east fighting and killing Muslims in Khorasan, Iraq, Syria, Arabian Peninsula and other places, Shia Rafidah have been aiding them in fighting Muslims. The Shia Prime Minister of Bagdad (at that time) called al-'Alqami and his like are the greatest aids of those unbelievers against Muslims and the same is the case with those Rafidah who are living in Syria, in cities such as Halab, they are among the greatest aids and support on fighting Muslims. When Muslims are fighting the Christians (Crusaders) in Syria the Shia Rafidah are one of their greatest helpers. Furthermore, if the Jews are able to establish a state in Iraq or other place (in the Muslims country) you will find that Shia Rafidah are their greatest aids; they are always befriending and aiding unbelievers of the polytheists, the Jews and the Christians; they aid and support them in fighting Muslims and erecting enmity against them.

This Shia Rafidi claimed that Imams are infallible; it is only a claim that has not been proven except what they have been saying all the time that: Allah does not leave the world for a moment without infallible Imams due to benefits and graces that are obtained by that. Now, it is well known that there isn't any benefit or grace that is obtained from this hidden, lost Imam that the Shia are waiting for, whether he is dead (not even created) as the generality of the Muslims are saying or is alive as the Shia think. There is none among the grandparents of the Shia hidden, awaited Imam through who the Muslims get benefits and graces that are acquired through an infallible leader that possess power and authority. For instance the Messenger of Allah after immigrating to Madina is the leader of the believers whose obedience is obligatory, and they will obtain by that happiness and success, benefits and grace and nobody became a leader with authority among those who Shia are claiming to be infallible leaders except Ali (r.a) during his Caliphates.

It is well known by necessity the graces and benefits that Muslims attained during the Caliphate of the first three Caliphs are greater than those they got during the Caliphate of Ali, for his reign was engrossed in conflicts, tribulations, and disunity. Since there is nobody among those who Shia, Imamiyyah, Rafidah are claiming to

be infallible who attained power and authority by the allegiance of those with influence in the Islamic community other than Imam Ali (r.a). And the benefits and grace that the Muslims got during his time are less than those attained during the first three Caliphs, it will be deduced that what Shia are claiming of benefits and graces that is obtainable with infallible Imams is a ruse and false claim. These are in the category of Shia Mahdi and the categories of believe in the men of the unseen as is found among the denizens of some Mountains in Lebanon and other mountains such as Mountain Qasyun in Damascus, the Cave of Blood, Mountain of Fathi in Egypt and similar cases and places of Mountains and Caves; in these place the Jinns live and with them are Satans who will be appearing sometimes to some people and hid themselves most of the times from views and the ignorant among men will think that they are human beings while in reality they are men among the Jinn. Allah the Most High said: **“And verily, there were men among mankind who took shelter with the masculine among the jinns, but they (jinns) increased them (mankind) in sin and disbelief” (82:6).**

Those people believe in them, so also those who imitate them and follow their ways among the misguided mystics, but the mystics who believe in men of the unseen do not fall into corruption to the extent in which those who believe in fallible Imams falls. Nay, corruption and evils that are attained by the latter are greater for they are inviting to infallible Imam and they do not have leaders with power and authority from whom they seek for aid except an unbeliever or a profligate or a hypocrite or an ignorant man. Their (actual) leader are within the confines of the mentioned classes of men. Shia Isma’iliyyah are worse than Shia Rafidah for they are inviting to infallible Imam and at the end their claims rested on atheists, profligates and hypocrites, there are among them those who are more evil than the Jews and the Christians.

Therefore, those who are claiming infallible Imam are not inviting to infallible Imam but rather to either the rule of an unbeliever or that of an unjust ruler, and this is something well known as their conduct to anybody who has knowledge of their conditions and conducts.

Allah the Sublime, the Most High has said: **“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad SAW), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger (SAW), if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination” (4:59).**

Allah has commanded believers whenever they differ to refer to Allah (Qur'an) and His Messenger (his Sunnah), so if to say people have an infallible leader other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), Allah would have commanded people to refer to him and thus the Qur'an showed that nobody is infallible other than Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

SEGMENT: LEADERS (IMAMS) ARE NOT CONFINED TO ANY NUMBER

The Rafidi said: “And they (Ahlus Sunnah) did not confine Imams to a particular number.”

We reply: This is a fact and this is because Allah the Exalted said: “O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger, if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination” (4:59). And He (Allah) did not confine them to a particular number. The Messenger of Allah said the same thing, for many hadiths that have been reported from him concurrently never confined or limited the number of leaders to a particular sum. In a hadith Abu Dhar said: *“Surely my beloved has advised me to listen and obey even if he (the leader) is an Ethiopian slave with amputated parts”* (Muslim, Abu Dawud).

SEGMENT: CORRECT VOW OF ALLEGIANCE

The Rafidi said: “(Ahlus Sunnah believe that) whoever give allegiance to a man from the Quraish clan of the Arabs his Caliphate is established and his obedience is obligatory on all people, even if his characters are unknown and even if he has gone to the extreme in disbelief, profligacy and hypocrisy.”

This claim can be replied from many angles:

Firstly; This is not a statement of Ahlus Sunnah and Jama'ah and it is not part of their school of thought that just because somebody has given vow of allegiance to someone of the Quraish, his authority has been established and he has become the leader who shall be obeyed by everybody. This statement is an opinion of some scholastic theologians but it is not an opinion of Ahlus Sunnah. Umar bin Khatab (r.a) said: ***“... Remember that whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consulting the other Muslims, neither that person, nor the person to whom the pledge of allegiance was given, are to be supported, lest they both should be killed” (Bukhari).***

Secondly, Ahlus Sunnah do not make obedience to a leader obligatory in whatever he commanded. Nay, they only command his obedience in obedience to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and in what did not contradict the law of Allah. Thus, it is not allowed that he shall be obeyed in disobedience to Allah even if he is a just leader, but if he command them to obey Allah they obey him. For instance, if he commanded them to establish prayer, pay Zakat, perform the pilgrimage, perform fasting, be just, be truthful, and fights in the cause of Allah, they are in reality obeying Allah. If an unbeliever and a profligate commanded what is obedience to Allah; obeying Allah cannot be forbidden and its obligation cannot be cancelled because a profligate (or an unbeliever) man has directed it, and also if he speaks the truth it cannot be denied. Obligation of following the truth cannot be cancelled because a profligate has commanded it. Thus Ahlus Sunnah are not advocating for absolute

obedience to rulers, but they are saying that they are obeyed under the purview of obeying the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), as Allah has commanded: **“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority ...” (4:59).** Thus, He commanded absolute obedience to Allah and command obedience to the Messenger of Allah because he does not command other than obedience to Allah. In another verse Allah said: **“He who obeys the Messenger (Muhammad), has indeed obeyed Allah, but he who turns away, then we have not sent you (O Muhammad) as a watcher over them” (4:80).** Allah made obedience to **“those of you who are in authority”** within obedience to Him and His Messenger (s.a.w) And He did not command a third obedience because a ruler is not given absolute obedience for he is only obeyed in what is good and fair. The Messenger of Allah said: **“Obedience is only in what is good and fair” (Musnad Ahmad).** And he said: **“There is no obedience in disobedience to Allah” (Musnad Ahmad).** He again said: **“There is no obedience to the created in disobedience to the Creator” (Musnad Ahmad).** And he said in another occasion: **“Whoever commanded you to disobey Allah, you shall not obey him” (Musnad Ahmad).**

Those Shia Rafidah who are ascribing themselves to the party of Ali (r.a) are saying that it is obligatory to give absolute obedience to other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in whatever he commanded. Thus, making their belief more corrupt than the statement of the party of Uthman among the Syrians who said it is obligatory to obey the ruler with absolute obedience, this is because they are obligating obedience to an existing leader while the Shia Rafidah are obligating the obedience to a none existing leader. Furthermore, those people are not claiming infallibility to their rulers as is the case with Rafidah. Nay, they are only viewing them like the right guided Caliphs and just rulers who can be imitated in what they do not know its reality or they are saying; Allah accepts from them good deeds and forgive them their bad deeds. Now, this belief is

lighter than those who are saying they are infallible and do not make mistakes.

Thus, it is clear to us that those Nawasib who are claiming to be the party of Uthman; though they have erred in some truth and justice, still the blunders of Shia from truth and justice are by far the worst. Then, how do you see the belief of Ahlus Sunnah which agreed with the Book of Allah the Most Exalted and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w), who are commanding obedience to a leader in what he commands of obedience to Allah in contrast to what he command of disobedience to Allah!!!

SEGMENT: ON QIYAS^[51] (DEDUCTIVE ANALOGY)

The Rafidi stated: All of them accepted deductive analogy and using opinion, and thus, introduced in the religion of Allah something that does not belong to it. They altered verdict of the Islamic laws, innovated four schools of thoughts which is none existent at the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and the time of his companions and they neglected the words of the companions although they have commanded that Qiyas shall be abandoned and they said: "The first to employ deductive analogy is Satan."

Reply to this is from many directions:

Firstly, his claim that all Ahlus Sunnah accepts the use of Qiyas in deducing Islamic law from its sources is a false claim for there are groups among them who rejected it such as some Bagdad scholars, the Zahiriyyah school of jurisprudence among its scholars such as Ibn Hazm and Dawud az-Zahiri, a group among scholars of hadith and some sages among the ascetics. Among Shia there are those who accepted Qiyas such as Zaidiyyah and thus the Shia have differed in it and likewise Ahlus Sunnah.

Secondly, although it is said that Qiyas is weak, but it is better than following a scholar that has not reached the degree of a Mujtahid (jurist consult) in knowledge. Whoever has knowledge and fairness know that the like of Imam Malik, Laith bin Sa'ad, al-'Auza'i, Abu Hanifa, al-Thauri, Ibn Abi Lailah, Imam Shafi'i, Ahmad Ishaq, Abi 'Abeid and AbiThaur have more knowledge and are more learned in jurisprudence than al-Askariyain (the tenth Shia Imam Ali An-Naqi Al-Hadi, and the eleventh Shia Imam Hasan Al-Askari) and those who are similar to them. Those scholars are better than the awaited Imam for nobody knows what he is saying or teaching.

All the scholars that accepted Qiyas as a method of deducing law from its sources never employ it if they have a sound Sunnah from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) on the issue under investigation for a sound text is give preference over Qiyas. The scholar who has no text on a particular issue and he did not employ Qiyas is ignorant, for

Qiyas that induced assumption is better than ignorance in which there is neither knowledge and nor assumption. If the Rafidi say all what they are saying are sound knowledge from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), then this is a weaker statement to that of those who are saying whatever a Mujtahid say are the words of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). This opinion is being propagated by a group of the proponents of intellectual reasoning and there statement is closer to the words of Rafidah because their words are clear lies.

Whenever Rafidah make false claims we can contrast them with the like of it or something better than it and whatever they stated of truth you will find among the Ahlus Sunnah who is saying the same truth or what is better than it, this is because innovation when compared to Sunnah is like belief and unbelief. Allah the Most High has said: **“And no example or similitude do they bring (to oppose or to find fault in you or in this Quran), but We reveal to you the truth (against that similitude or example), and the better explanation thereof” (25:33).**

Thirdly, those who introduced into the religion of Allah what is not part of it and altered the laws of Islam are found among Shia Rafidah more than any other group. Shia Rafidah have introduced in the religion of Islam a lot of lies against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) more than any sect or group, they rejected a lot of truth more than any group and they altered the Qur'an in such a way that nobody altered it other than them. Consider these samples of their alterations of the meaning of the Qur'an. They interpreted the words of Allah: **“Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer)” (4:55),** they said it was revealed concerning Ali (r.a) when gave out his ring as Zakat while praying. The words of Allah: **“He has let loosed the two seas (the salt water and the sweet) meeting together” (55:19),** they said it means Ali and Fatima. Concerning the words of Allah: **“Out of them both come out pearl and coral” (55:22),** they said it means Hasan and Husain. Where Allah said: **“... and all things We have**

recorded with numbers (as a record) in a Clear Book” (36:12), they said a clear Book means Ali bin Abi Talib. With regard to the words of Allah: **“Allah chose Adam, Noah, the family of Abraham and the family of 'Imran above the 'Alamin (mankind and jinns) (of their times)” (3:33),** they said family of Imran means family of Abu Talib, the name Imran is the name of Abu Talib. With regard to the words of Allah: **“... then fight (you) the leaders of disbelief - for surely their oaths are nothing to them - so that they may stop (evil actions)” (9:12),** they said it means Talha and Zubair. With regard to the words of Allah: **“... and likewise the accursed tree (Zaqqum, mentioned) in the Quran...” (17:60),** they said the accursed tree means Banu Umayyah. Where Allah stated: **“And (remember) when Musa (Moses) said to his people: “Verily, Allah commands you that you slaughter a cow...” (2:67),** they said it means Aisha. Where Allah said: **“... If you join others in worship with Allah, (then) surely (all) your deeds will be in vain, and you will certainly be among the losers” (39:65),** they say it means if you commit polytheism by loving Abubakar and Ali at the same time, all your deeds are in vain and you will be among the denizens of Hell-Fire^[52]. All these alterations of the Qur'an are found in their books and from this door Isma'iliyyah and Nusairiyyah entered and gave altered meanings to the commands of Allah regarding the allowed and the forbidden. Thus, they are the leaders of altering the words of Allah from its intended meaning. Whoever study the books of Shia Rafidah will find a lot of liars against the Messenger of Allah, rejecting the truth and sound hadiths and altering meaning of sound texts more than what is found in any sect that ascribed itself to Islam. Consequently, they have undoubtedly introduced into the religion of Allah what is not part of it more than any sect, and altered the Book of Allah in a way that is not done by any group.

Fourthly, the Shia Rafidi contended that: “Ahlus Sunnah have innovated the four schools of jurisprudence that neither exists at the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) nor his companion and they have neglected the teachings of the Prophet's companions (r.a).”

We say to him: When did differing with the companions and neglecting their words become objectionable and detestable to Shia Imamiyyah? Ahlus Sunnah have agreed upon loving all the companions (r.a), befriending them, aiding them and given them preference and superiority over all other (people) periods and times. They also have agreed upon the law that their consensus or agreement is an evidence and proof with which Allah is worshipped and obeyed; they never reject or neglect their consensus. Nay, all their Imams, scholars and Mujtahids (jurist consults) are saying that we shall never neglect the words of a companion. Thus, how can anybody disparage them and say that they neglected the companions (r.a), especially the one whose belief is that their consensus is neither evidence nor any proof and is ascribing them to unbelief and injustice!!!

Now if their consensus is evidence, then it is proof over the two parties and if it is no evidence, there is no need to use it as evidence against us.

If the Rafidi said: "Ahlus Sunnah considered the consensus of the Prophet's companions as evidence but they have contradicted and neglected it."

We reply him saying: It is inconceivable that Ahlus Sunnah will agree and have a consensus on contradicting the consensus of the companions (r.a). As for Shia Imamiyyah Rafidah, they have agreed upon neglecting, contradicting and rejecting the consensus of the family of the Messenger of Allah, his progeny and his companions. This is because there is nobody among the Prophet's progeny – Banu Hashim – at the time of the Messenger of Allah and at the periods of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (r.a) who is preaching or talking about the leadership of twelve Imams or the infallibility of anybody other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Nobody among them is saying that the first three Caliphs have apostate. Nay, nobody is even disparaging or disproving their leadership and there is nobody among them who reject Allah's attributes or deny Qadr (predestination).

Thus, undoubtedly Shia Imamiyyah Rafidah have all agreed upon contradicting consensus of the Prophet's family and progeny, in addition to rejecting the consensus of the Prophet's companions. Therefore, why are they objecting to those who did not reject the consensus of the Prophet's companions and the consensus of the Prophet's family and progeny?

Fifthly, The words of the Rafidi: "They invented the four schools of jurisprudence that do not exist during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w)."

We reply that: If he means that they agreed to innovate these schools of jurisprudence in order to differ with the Prophet's companions; then know that that is a lie for those scholars have not been in one period. Nay, Imam Abu Hanifa died in the year 150AH, Imam Malik died in the year 188AH, Imam Shafi'i died in the year 205AH and Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal died in the year 241AH; none among those scholars imitate the other and none of them commanded people to follow him. Nay, each and every one of them is calling people to follow the Qur'an and Sunnah and if any one state a word that contradicted the Qur'an or Sunnah at his presence he reject it and he never made it obligatory upon people to follow his teachings or verdicts.

If you say: "People have followed those schools of jurisprudence."

We reply that: This has not taken place by connivance or collusion, but it happens that these people followed this one and those people followed that one, just like the pilgrims who decided to follow this guide who will show them the way and another group of pilgrims decided to follow another guide because they think that he might be better as a guide and that is what happen to others. If this is the case, it entailed that Ahlus Sunnah did not agree on falsehood because each group among them disagree with what others possess of mistake. So they did not agree that a particular person must agree with whatever those scholars or any of them say, nay the generality of their scholars do not command the illiterate to follow a particular

person other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in whatever he says.

Allah the Most High has guaranteed the Islamic community infallibility from going astray and it is of the perfection of infallibility to make a number of scholars, whenever one of them make mistake in something another one's verdict is right so that the truth will not be lost. That is why if some of them make mistakes on some issues - like the issues he has mentioned - the truth is in the verdict of another scholar. Thus, absolutely Ahlus Sunnah never agrees on falsehood. The mistake that some of them made in some religious issues is not harmful. Concerning Shia Rafidah, it shall be known that on whatever issue they differed with all Ahlus Sunnah; they have erred on it, the way Jews and Christian have erred in whatever they differed with the Muslims.

Sixthly, the Rafidid stated: "These schools of jurisprudence do not exist at the time of the Messenger of Allah and his companions."

We reply that: If he means that their statements have not been taken from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his companions (r.a) and that they have neglected the words of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and the companions and innovated something contrary to that; then this is a lie against them, for they never agree upon contradicting the companions. Nay, they and the rest of Ahlus Sunnah follow the companions in what they say. If some Ahlus Sunnah contradicted them because he did not come to know what they have said; the rest of them agreed and affirm the error of whoever contradicted them (by pointing to it and rejecting it). If he (the Rafidi) means that those scholars have not been in that period (of the Prophet's companions); then know that this is not disallowed for it is well known that each period that comes will be after the first century.

Seventhly, his (the Rafidi) statement: "And they neglected the words of the Prophet's companions."

We reply that: This is a lie from him. Nay, the books of the Imams of the schools of jurisprudence are filled with quotations and citations of the statements of the companions (r.a) and advancing proofs and evidences with them, although each school may possess what is not in the other school of their statements. If he (the Rafidi) says: I mean by that they are not saying the school of Abubakar or Umar etc. The reply is that: The reason for this is that each one of them recorded hadiths (and teachings of the companion) and added to it what he has deduced from their teachings. It is the people who ascribed those works to him, in the like manner that the books of hadiths are ascribed to those who gathered and recorded the hadiths i.e. Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawud etc., recitations of the Qur'an are ascribed to those who choose it i.e. Nafi'i and Ibn Kathir.

Most of what those scholars are saying are taken from those before them and what some of them stated is not taken from their predecessors but he deduced it from those principles. After them there are those who evaluated what they have said and explain what is a mistake according to his findings. All these are a protection for this religion so that those who professed it will be as Allah has described them: **“The believers, men and women, are Auliya' (helpers, supporters, friends, protectors) of one another, they enjoin (on the people) Al-Ma'ruf (i.e. Islamic Monotheism and all that Islam orders one to do), and forbid (people) from Al-Munkar (i.e. polytheism and disbelief of all kinds, and all that Islam has forbidden); they perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat) and give the Zakat, and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah will have His Mercy on them. Surely Allah is All-Mighty, All-Wise” (9:71).** So whenever any one of them made mistake or erred intentionally somebody will correct him. And scholars are not greater than Prophets. Allah the Most High has said: **“And (remember) David and Solomon, when they gave judgment in the case of the field in which the sheep of certain people had pastured at night and We were witness to their judgment. And We made Solomon to understand (the case), and to each of them We gave Hukman (right judgment of the affairs and Prophethood) and knowledge.**

And We subjected the mountains and the birds to glorify Our Praises along with David, And it was We Who were the doers (of all these things).” (21:78-79).

It is related in a sound hadith on the authority of Abdullah bin Umar (r.a) that the Messenger of Allah said to his companions at the year of the Battle of the Ditch: ***“None of you shall pray Asr prayer until he reach (the settlement of) Bani Quraizah. The time of Asr prayer arrived while they are still on the way. Some of them said: The Messenger of Allah didn’t mean that we shouldn’t pray in time, so they prayed on the way. Another group said: We will not pray until we reach Bani Quraizah, so they prayed Asr after the sun has set. The Messenger of Allah didn’t castigate any of the groups”*** (Bukhari, Muslim). This is a proof that Mujtahids can differ in understanding the statement of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and none of them has committed a sin.

Eighthly, nobody among the Ahlus Sunnah said that the consensus of the four scholars is an infallible proof and nobody said that the truth is confined to them and whatever is not from them is false. Nay, if somebody who is not a follower of those scholars, - such as al-‘Auza’i and Laith bin Sa’ad or those before them or those after them among the Mujtahids – says something that contradicted the verdict of the four scholars; their bond of contention will be referred to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), and the preferred verdict is the one that has been supported (by Qur’an or Sunnah).

Ninthly, the Rafidi said: “Prophet Companions (r.a) advised that Qiyas shall be abandoned.”

We reply that: The generality of Muslims scholars who are employing Qiyas stated that the prophet’s companions have used juristic reasoning, [\[53\]](#) opinion and Qiyas (to arrive at a verdict), and they have also faulted some types of Qiyas; both statements are right. The type of Qiyas that is condemned is the one that contradicted a text (Qur’anic verse or hadith) like the Qiyas of those who said: Trading is like usury, and the Qiyas which Satan used to disobey the command of Allah by refusing to bow down to Adam (a.s); and the

Qiyas of the polytheists who said: Do you eat what you killed (slaughtered of animals) but you do not eat what Allah has killed? Allah the Most High said: **“Eat not (O believers) of that (meat) on which Allah's Name has not been pronounced (at the time of the slaughtering of the animal), for sure it is Fisq (a sin and disobedience of Allah). And certainly, the devils do inspire their friends (from mankind) to dispute with you, and if you obey them [by making a dead animal legal by eating it], then you would indeed be Mushrikun (polytheists) [because they (devils and their friends) made lawful to you to eat that which Allah has made unlawful to eat and you obeyed them by considering it lawful to eat, and by doing so you worshipped them, and to worship others besides Allah is polytheism]” (6:121).**

Qiyas that is also forbidden is the Qiyas in which the branch has no relationship with the basis in the area of judgment. Therefore Qiyas is censured either due to lack of basic condition; which is lack of correlation in the area of judgment or due to hindrance; which is a text (verse of the Qur'an or Sunnah) that must be given priority over it, even if they are correlated on the same issue. Thus the condition cannot be neglected except if there is a hindrance and there is no hindrance unless if the condition is missing.

With regard to the Qiyas in which the basis and branch are similar in correlation of judgment and has not been contradicted by what is superior to it; this is the type of Qiyas that is followed. There is no doubt that there are corrupt Qiyas and that many scholars made corrupt Qiyas and some of them are false by textual proofs. While the falsity of some of it has been agreed upon; but the falsity of many Qiyas does not entail that all of it is false, similarly the existence of a lot of liars in hadith does not obligate rejecting all of it.

SEGMENT: ON SHIA IMAMIYYAH CLAIM THAT FOLLOWING THEIR CREED IS OBLIGATORY

The Rafidi said: The second proof; providing evidences on the obligation of following the Imamiyyah creed. This is what our greatest scholar, Sheikh Muhammad bin Hasan at-Tusi, may Allah sanctify his soul, stated when he was asked concerning the sects: We searched for it and studied the words of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w): ***“My community will break up into seventy three sects, one of them is the successful sect and the rest are in Hell-Fire” (Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi).*** He has identified the successful sect and the damned sect in his words: “The likelihood of members of my family is that of Noah’s ship, whoever mounts it will escape and whoever abandoned it will be drowned (perish).” We found out that the successful sect is the sect of Imamiyyah, because they have differed from all sects and all the other sects are associates in principle of religion.

We say: Reply to this is from many perspectives;

Firstly, this Rafidi has forgotten that he has excommunicated from Islam whoever believed that Allah can wish what will not occur and what He does not wish to happen can occur^[54] and this is the belief of his Sheikh (Muhammad bin Hasan at-Tusi) in addition to this he also believed that the world has no begging, he stated that in his book “Sharh al-Isharat.” This entailed that the Sheikh with whom he is proving his creed is an unbeliever and the words of an unbeliever is not acceptable in the religion of Islam.

Secondly, this man (the Shia Sheikh Tusi) is well known and notorious to all people (both the influential and the masses). He was the Minister of the atheists, batinites Isma’iliyyah in Almut^[55] and when the Mongols, the polytheists attacked Muslims countries and arrived at Bagdad, the capital of the Caliphate, this scholar – who is an astrologist (soothsayer predicting the future from the stars) – became an adviser to the King of the polytheists Mongols, Hulagu. He advised him to kill the Caliph, religious men and the scholars and

to spare the life of artisans and traders who will benefit him in the world. He (al-Tusi) looted the endowment funds (treasury) of the Muslims and he donates out of it whatever he wished to scholars of polytheism and their Sheikhs among the Magicians and the likes. He built an observatory in a place called Miragha on the architectural designs of Sabians, the polytheists places of worship. He always persecute those whose religion is closer to the religion of Allah and those who enjoyed his patronage are those who are far away from the religion of Allah such as the Sabians, the polytheists, those who denied Allah's attributes who are also polytheists although their professions are astrology, sooth-saying and medicine. It is well known that Sheikh Tusi and his students and followers treats Islamic religious obligations, its command and its forbidden with disdain, contempt and scorn. They do not establish prayer and they commits what Allah has forbidden such as licentiousness, illegal sexual intercourse, wine drinking and other detestable acts; even in the month of Ramadan they neglect prayer, commits profligacies and drink wine – these are known as their conducts by all those who know them. They do not possess any authority or power except with the aid of polytheists and unbelievers whose religion is eviler than the Jewish religion and Christianity.

For the above reasons whenever Islamic religion is strengthened among the Mongols (when they) embraced Islam the affairs of those people (Sheikh Tusi and his followers) became weakened due to their extreme enmity and hatred of Islam and the Muslims. That is the reason why they are the most mean and despicable of people in the estimations of King Nuruz, the martyr, Mujahid (one who fight in the way of Allah) who invited the King of the Mongols, Gazan to Islam and promised to aid him if he embraces Islam. He also fought the polytheists among the Bakhshiyyah the magicians and others, he destroyed their shrines, destroyed their idols and its keepers. He also obligated the payment of Jizyah (protection tax) on the Jews and Christian in humiliation; it is due to his efforts that the Mongols embraced Islam.

Summarily the affairs and conducts of Sheikh Tusi and his follower are well known to the Muslims to the extent that there is no need to recount it or described it. With all these, it has been said that during the last period of his life he used to pray the five daily prayers regularly and he started studying exegesis of the Qur'an by al-Bagawiy and jurisprudence etc. If it is true that he has repented from atheism, then surely Allah accepts the repentance of His servant and forgives evil deeds. Allah the Exalted said: **“Say: ‘O My slaves who have transgressed against themselves (by committing evil deeds and sins)! Despair not of the Mercy of Allah, verily Allah forgives all sins. Truly, He is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful’” (39:53).**

What this Rafidi mentioned concerning Sheikh Tusi; if it is stated before his repentance, then his words are not acceptable and if it is after repentance, then that entailed that he did not repent from Rafidah creed and atheism. Based on the two probabilities, his words are unacceptable. What is more apparent with regard to his conducts is that he used to meet with men like him when he was a soothsayer of the polytheists Mongols and it is well known that he is an atheist at that time.

Thus, whoever disparaged Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and other of the Muhajirun and Ansar and attack the like of Imam Malik, Shafi'i, Abu Hanifa, Ahmad bin Hanbal and their followers and he find fault in them due to mistakes of other people such as allowing playing chessboard and some types of music; how can such a person find it suitable for himself to prove his creed with the words of such people (Sheikh Tusi and his like), who did not believe in Allah and the Last Day and they do not forbid what Allah and His Messenger has forbidden and they are not practicing the religion of truth; they allowed what has been agreed upon as forbidden such as illegal sexual intercourse, drinking wine even during the month of Ramadan, those who have forsaken prayers and followed their vain desires, destroyed all religious laws, took what has been forbidden by the religion lightly and followed the path of other than that of the believers. Shia Rafidah are as it is stated by a poet:

The religion complained of tribulation
sect

From a philosophic

They do not attend prayers
simulation

But for the sake of

They consider not religious laws
They prefer over religion

But as civil politics
Philosophic principles

This is the state of Rafidah: They always display enmity against the pious, friends of Allah – of the first to embrace Islam; the Muhajirun and Ansar and those who followed in their footsteps with goodness and they befriend and aid unbelievers and hypocrites (against Muslims and Islam). Surely, the greatest hypocrites among those who ascribed themselves to Islam are atheists, Batinite, Isma'iliyyah and whoever used their words to support his creed – with all that have been mentioned of his disparagement by the Muslims scholars – is among the greatest aids and lover of the hypocrites and the greatest enemy of the believers.

It is surprising that this writer, liar, slanderer, evil Rafidi is mentioning Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and all the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar and those who followed them with good and the Muslims scholars that possessed religion and knowledge with lies that he concocted against them; he and his brothers. And then he will present a person who is notorious for his opposition to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and then state: "Our great Sheikh has said," and states: "May Allah sanctify his soul," while at the same time he has confessed that he and his types are unbelievers; and his cursing the group of the best believers among the first and the last people (Muslims). Those people (Shia Rafidah) are encompassed in the words of Allah: **"Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Scripture? They believe in Jibt (magic) and Taghut (idols) and say to the disbelievers that they are better guided as regards the way than the believers (Muslims)" (4:51).**

Those Shia Imamiyyah have been given a portion of the Scripture (Qur'an) because they accept part of what is in the revealed Book and they have branches of belief in Jibt, which is magic and Taghut, which is whatever is worshipped beside Allah. This is because they

honors philosophy that contained that, they believed in invoking and worshipping the dead, they build their mosques upon graves and they make pilgrimage to them and outlined its rituals and they call them: "Rituals of pilgrimage to shrines." Some reliable men informed me that there are among them who believed going to pilgrimage to those shrines is better than going to pilgrimage to the House of Allah in Makka. Thus to them worshipping other than Allah is greater than worshipping Allah; and this the greatest belief in Tagut.^[56]

They (the Shia Rafida) are saying that the person who they have confessed is an unbeliever, because he is among those who are saying that the world has no beginning, who are soothsayers and who are justifying polytheism; those are more guided than the believers. This is because they have preferred those atheists, polytheists over the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar. They also always aid in fighting Muslims, this is a fact known by everybody and that is why it is said: There is never a time when a Jew fight a Muslim or a polytheist fights a Muslim except that you find a Rafidi aiding the Jew or the Christian or the polytheist (against the Muslim).

Thirdly, it is well known that Shia Isma'iliyyah and Nusairiyyah are among those who are displaying love of Imam Ali (r.a) and his partisanship although in their hearts they are unbelievers who do not belong to any religion. Nusairiyyah are among the extremists Rafidah who believed that Ali is god and they are worst than the Jews, Christians and the polytheists by the consensus of all Muslims. The Isma'iliyyah Batinites are worst than them in disbelief for they negates Allah's attributes. The companions of the higher-ranking scholar among them believed only in time (or nature); that the world has no Creator, and they say: there is no difference between the philosophers and us except that they believe in Allah and to us He is not a reality. They also treat and show contempt and disdain to the Most Beautiful Names of Allah and His attributes and especially the name of Allah for some of them will write it under the feet of their legs and steps on it. Another group of the Isma'iliyyah

believe in the antecedent and the subsequent; [57]these are the same things that the philosophers called the first intellect and the soul and the Magians (ans Zoroastrians) called the light and the darkness, so they mixed Sabians beliefs with those of the Magians and then they pretend that they are Shia.

There is no doubt that the Magians and the Sabians are more evil than the Jews and the Christians. They feigned and pretend being Shia (as a camouflage to propagate their creed among the masses and the ignorant) and they choose Shiism out of all sects because according to them: "The Shia are the quickest group to believe and accept our creed because they are out of the bounds of Islam, they are ignorant people and they believe in absurdities and mysteries."

[58] This is why there scholars internally are philosophers, just like this Naseer Tusi and Kisan al-Basri who went to their enclaves in Syria and he used to say: "I have removed and uplifted the obligations of praying, fasting, pilgrimage and paying Zakat on them."

Thus, if the Isma'ilyyah feigned Islam through Shiism, it is through it that they entered and it is through it that they got some success (in misleading people). Its adherents are those who migrated to them (their enclaves) and not those who migrate for the sake of Allah and His Messenger and they are their helpers and not helpers of Allah and His Messenger. It is thus understood that the testimony they gave that the Shia are on the right path is a rejected testimony by the consensus of those who have intellect. This is because this witness is well known to profess beliefs that contradicts Islam and that he only pretended to be a Shia so that he can deceive Muslims (and propagate his creed). Therefore, he need to magnify Shia creed (to achieve his aim), and his testimony in support of Shiism is a testimony of a person in order to aid himself. It is just like a man testifying for himself and while giving that testimony he knew that he is lying the way he lie in all issues pertaining to himself, even if he believe in Islam in his heart and he think that those people are on the

religion of Islam although he is ignorant and misguided; this type of man is testifying for himself.

On the basis of the two assumptions a person's testimony for himself is unacceptable whether he knew that he is lying or he believe that he is telling the truth. It comes in a hadith that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***"The testimony of the opponent, the suspected, and the person whose heart is filled with bad feelings against his brother is no acceptable"* (Musnad Ahmad).** And those two men (the Rafidi and his Sheikh Tusi) are opponents, suspects and their hearts are filled with hatred against Ahlus Sunnah and Jama'ah and therefore, their testimonies are rejected from all perspectives.

Fourthly. It will be said (to Shia Rafidah): You people do not take these types of hadiths as evidence or proofs, for they are hadiths that have been narrated by Ahlus Sunnah and its chains of authorities contained Ahlus Sunnah (men). The hadith is not recorded in Bukhari and Muslim. Nay, some scholars of hadith have faulted it, such as Ibn Hazm and others; but it has been narrated by the authors of Sunnan hadith compendiums such as Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi (who said it is good and sound and it has many sources) and Ibn Majah and it has been recorded by authors of Masanid compendiums of hadith such as Imam Ahmad etc. How do you determine its soundness in accordance to your principle? If it is assumed that it is sound, it is an Ahad hadith (a lone or single hadith). Thus, how can you advance evidence with a hadith Ahad in one of the principles of religion and to ascribe all Muslims to straying - except one sect – with a hadith Ahad which they themselves do not accepts as evidence even in branches of religious observances? Is this anything other than a great contradiction and ignorance?

Fifthly, explanation of the Hadith has been narrated in two ways. The first is that when the Messenger of Allah was asked concerning the successful sect he said: ***"The one which is on the like of what I am on, I and my companions."*** In another narration he said: ***"They are the Jama'ah (Muslim community)."*** Each of the two

interpretations negated the statement of Shia Rafidah and that entailed that they are outside the fold of the successful sect because they do not belong to the Muslim community. They ascribed unbelief or profligacy to the leaders of the Islamic community like Abubakar, Umar and Uthman – leave alone Mu'awiyah and the Caliphs of Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas – and they also ascribed to unbelief the scholars of Muslims community and their religious men such as Imam Malik, ath-Thauri, al-'Auzaa'i, Laith bin Sa'ad, Abu Hanifa, Ahmad bin Hanbal, Shafi'i, Ishaq, Abi 'Ubaidah, Ibrahim bin Adham, Fudail bin 'Iyad, Abi Sulaiman al-Darani and Ma'aruf al-Khurkhithi etc. Shia Imamiyyah Rafidah are the most ignorant of people with regard to knowing the life history of the Prophet's companions and are the farthest away people from following their footsteps, neither during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w) nor after his death. This is because that can only be known by the scholars of hadith, citations and narrations and having the knowledge of weak reporters and those who are reliable. Shia Rafidah are the greatest people who are ignorant of the Sunnah, they hate it and hates its scholars bitterly. Therefore, if the description of the successful sect is: Those who follow the companions in the period of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Then that is the maxim of Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah; therefore the successful sect is Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah. The Sunnah is what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his companions are practicing at his period and it is what he commanded them to do, what he confirmed of their actions and what he practiced. The Jama'ah are those people who gathered and stayed together and did not break their religion into sects. Thus, those who break their religion into sects are not part of the Jama'ah; Allah has absolved His Prophet (s.a.w) from them (in the Qur'an) and therefore, it is established that that is the description of Ahlus Sunnah and Jama'ah and not the description of Shia Rafidah. The hadith described the successful sect as the one that followed his Sunnah and what he has been practicing, he and his companions and by remaining in the community of the Muslims (being loyal to its leaders).

If it is said (by the Rafidi): He (the Prophet) said: “Whichever is on the like of what I and my companions are practicing.” Therefore whoever left that path after him is not on the path of the successful sect; they have apostate after him and thus they are not the successful sect.

We reply saying: Yes, the most notorious men to apostate after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) are the opponents of Abubakar (r.a) and his followers, such as Musailamah the liar and his followers etc., and these are the people who are loved by and defended by Rafidah as it is stated by many of their scholars among whom is this Rafidi; they are saying that those people (Musailamah and his followers and those who refused to pay Zakat) are right and with them is the truth while Abubakar (r.a) fought them unjustly. (You will find that) among those who are notorious apostates are the extremists Shia who were burnt by Imam Ali (r.a) with fire when they claimed that he is god; they are Saba'ites the followers of Abdullah bin Saba and these are the first people to openly curse Abubakar and Umar (r.a).

The first person to claim that he is a prophet is Mukhtar bin Abi 'Ubaid and he is a Shia adherent and thus it is very clear that the greatest people that apostate and abandoned Islam are of the Shia. They apostate from Islam more than any other sect and the worst forms of apostasy are found among Shia extremists such as Nusairiyyah and Ismai'iliyyah the batinites etc. Therefore, you will never find apostates in a greater number than in the groups that opposes Abubakar and this showed that the apostates in whose progeny apostasy continued to this day are the Shia Rafidah; they more deserved that than Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah. This is very clear to all men of intellect who knew Islam and its adherents, and nobody has any doubt that the groups and sects of apostates among the Shia displays more unbelief than the groups of apostates that ascribed themselves to Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah; if there is any apostate among them.

Sixthly, we say: This evidence that has been brought forward by Sheikh Tusi contending that Shia Imamiyyah is the successful sect is

a lie by definition and false in what it indicates. That is where he stated: "They (Shia) have differed from all sects and all other sects have common principles of beliefs." If this Rafidi means that they have differed from all sects in what is peculiar to their sect, then it shall be known that this is the situation with all other sects because the Kharijites also have differed in what is peculiar to them, such as the issues of ascribing whoever commit a sin to unbelief, ascribing Imam Ali (r.a) to apostasy, their rejection of obeying the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in whatever he did not ascribe to Allah, their belief that he can commit injustice in distribution (of war booty) and judgments and their rejection of concurrent Sunnah which they think has contradicted the Qur'an such as their cutting of the hand of a thief from his shoulder (instead of from the wrist) etc. If this Rafidi means that they have differed with all sects in their beliefs (and observances); this is also not true because in their Tauhid they have agreed with Mu'atazilites and their predecessors have been Mujassamah.^[59] In their (Shia) belief in Qadr they agreed with Mu'atazilites. Summarily Shia have beliefs that are peculiar to them and they have beliefs in which they are associated with other sects and the same situation is applicable to all other sects and groups such as Kharijites and the Mu'atazilites etc. With regard to the Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah, they are peculiar in following the Qur'an and Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in both principles of religion and its branches, and what the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has been practicing in contrast to Khawarij, Mu'atazilites and Shia Rafidah and those who have agreed with them in some of their beliefs, for they do not follow the hadith of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) that has been related by reliable truth worthy men on his authority and which soundness has been established by hadiths scholars.

Seventhly, we say: Your differing with all sects indicates more to the falsity of your beliefs than in its soundness, because just being alone, isolated with a peculiar creed contrary to all other sects does not show that that is the right belief and being associated in a belief with other sects does not means that that creed is false.

If you (Rafidi) say: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has stated that there will be seventy three sects and therefore the right sect must differ with the other seventy two sects!!!

We say: Yes! The hadith also showed that all the seventy two sects will differ with each other, just as you have differed with this one (Ahlus Sunnah). Thus, there is nothing in the hadith showing that the other seventy two sects will be associated in principles of beliefs. Nay, there is nothing apparent in the hadith other than all the seventy three sects differed with each other and thus it will be understood that breaking up into sects is something that is blameworthy and censured and not a praiseworthy action. Surely, Allah the Exalted has commanded remaining in the community (Jama'ah) and unity and faulted differing and breaking up into sects and groups. Allah the Most High said: **“And hold fast, all of you together, to the Rope of Allah (i.e. this Quran), and be not divided among yourselves...” (3:103).** In another verse Allah said: **“And be not as those who divided and differed among themselves after the clear proofs had come to them. It is they for whom there is an awful torment. On the Day (i.e. the Day of Resurrection) when some faces will become white and some faces will become black; as for those whose faces will become black (to them will be said): ‘Did you reject Faith after accepting it? Then taste the torment (in Hell) for rejecting Faith’” (3:106).** Abdullah Ibn Abbas (r.a) and other scholars while commenting on the above verses said: ***“The faces of Ahlus Sunnah will be white and the faces of people of innovation and division will be black.”***

Allah the Most High also said: **“Verily, those who divide their religion and break up into sects (all kinds of religious sects), you (O Muhammad) have no concern in them in the least. Their affair is only with Allah, Who then will tell them what they used to do” (6:159).** And He said: **“...And only those to whom (the Scripture) was given differed concerning it after clear proofs had come unto them through hatred, one to another. Then Allah by His Leave guided those who believed to the truth of that wherein they differed. And Allah guides whom He wills to a**

Straight Path” (2:213). In another verse Allah said: **“And the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) differed not until after there came to them clear evidence. (i.e. Prophet Muhammad and whatever was revealed to him)” (98:4).**

If that is the case, the greatest sect that differed with the Jama'ah and differed within itself deserved more to be censured and the one that has less internal differences and less differences with the Jama'ah is closer to the truth. If Shia Imamiyyah is the first in the ranking of differing with all sects that ascribed themselves to Islam; then that entailed that they are the farthest away from the truth especially if you view the fact that they have differed within themselves more than all the sects in the Islamic community to the extent of breaking more than seventy two different sects as stated by some scholars. This is the number mentioned by Sheikh Tusi and some of his companions when he stated: “Shia sects have reached seventy two groups.” Hasan bin Musa an-Nubikhti (a Shia scholar) - and other people – have written a book in which he numbered Shia sects (and their beliefs)

Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah have less differences in their principles of religion than all other sects and they are closer to each sect than the sect that opposes it for they are in the middle course among all those who professed Islam, just as those who professed Islam are in the middle course among all other religions. Ahlus Sunnah are in the middle course on the issue of Allah's attributes between those who negate them (Mu'attilah) and those who equated them to those of human beings (Mushabbihah). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“The best of all things is the middle course.”*** Thus, Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah is the best of all other sects.

Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah are in the middle course on the issue of Qadr (predestination) between those who denied it and those who uses it as an excuse for whatever they commit of crimes and sins, on the issues of Names (of Allah) and (His) Laws they are in the middle course between Wa'idiiyah^[60] and the Murji'ah.^[61] On the issue of the Prophet's companions (r.a) Ahlus Sunnah are in the middle

course between the extremists and those that treat them with contempt. Thus, they do not go to the extreme with regard to Imam Ali (r.a) as the Shia Rafidah have gone (by calling him god or giving him some attributes of Allah)^[62] and they do not excommunicate him from Islam as the Kharijites has done. They do not excommunicate Abubakar and Umar (r.a) from Islam as the Rafidah has done, and they do not excommunicate Uthman and Ali (r.a) from Islam as the Kharijites has done.

Eighthly, we reply to this Rafidi by telling him that Shia do not possess one belief upon which they have all agreed upon, and the statement he made is just one of the opinions of Shia Imamiyyah (on the subject). This is because among the Imamiyyah sects there are those who contradict and differ with Rafidah on the issues of Tauhid (Oneness of Allah) and His justice. Furthermore, the generality of the Shia differed with Imamiyyah Ithna Ashriyyah because Shia Zaidiyyah and Isma'iliyyah etc. have agreed upon rejecting the Imamah (leadership) of the twelve Imams.

Shia Imamiyyah Ithna Ashriyyah are saying that the principles of religion are four: Oneness of Allah, Justice, Prophethood and Imamah (leadership). With regard to Prophethood their belief is similar to that of all Muslims and their differences on the issue of Imamah are greater than the differences found in the whole Islamic community. If Shia Ithna Ashriyyah said: We are greater in number than all Shia sects and therefore the truth is with us. They are replied: Ahlus Sunnah are greater than you in number and therefore the truth is with them and not you. The extent you have reached is that all the sects of Shia Imamiyyah in comparison to you is like your rank with the rest of the Muslims (just a minority). Islam is the religion of Allah that unite the people of truth.

SEGMENT: ON THE EXPLANATION THAT SHIA IMAMIYYAH HAVE CERTITUDE OF SUCCESS FOR THEMSELVES AND THEIR IMAMS IS A MIRAGE

The Rafidi stated: “Thirdly, Undoubtedly Shia Imamiyyah are certain of success (entering Paradise) for themselves and their Imams, they are sure about that and they are sure that all sects other than themselves will not be successful. Ahlus Sunnah do not allow such idea and they are not sure concerning that; neither for themselves nor for other people and therefore those who are sure of success are more deserved to be followed. This is because, for instance, if two people set out of Bagdad on their way to Kufa and the way branched into two paths, thereafter each one of them took a path and then a third man set out to Kufa and he asked one of them: Where are you going? He replied: To Kufa! He asked him again: Can your path take you to Kufa? Can the path of your companion take him to Kufa? Is he safe and secure or in danger? He replied him saying: I do not know anything about that. Then he asked his companion who replied: My path can take me to Kufa, it is peaceful and I know that the path of my companion will not take him to Kufa and it is not secure. In these cases if the third person takes the path of the first person, people with intelligence will consider him a fool and if he follows the path of second person he will be considered as person who has taken to the path of certainty.”

(Ibn Taimiyyah stated): This is how he stated the example in his book and the right expression shall be: He asked the second man and the second man said to him; I do not know whether my path will take me to Kufa and I do not know whether it is secure and safe and whether it is dangerous.

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly, that we say: If obeying leaders upon whom absolute obedience is claimed necessitates for them success (Paradise in the Hereafter), then obeying the Caliphs of Bani Umayyah by those who believe that giving leaders absolute obedience is imperative and

their saying: That will necessitate the success of those who are on the right path; those people curse Imam Ali (r.a) and other people and they fought those who fight them among the Shia of Ali; it means that those people are also right. This is because they used to believe that giving leaders absolute obedience is obligatory in everything and matter, that Allah will not chastise leaders for their sins and they did not commit any sin in whatever they obeyed a leader. Nay those people have stronger claim than the Shia because they have been obeying leaders that have been given power and authority by Allah, Who aided them and established them. Thus if the creed of Qadriyyah (most Shia Imamiyyah scholars are Qadriyyah in beliefs) is that Allah will not cause to occur upon His slaves but what is the most beneficial to them, then (according to this Shia creed) investing and establishing those leaders with authority is a grace for his slaves.

It is well known that the benefits and grace that has been attained through them are greater than the grace and benefits that has been attained with none existing Imam and an incapacitated (out of action) Imam (all Shia Imams did not exercise authority except Imam Ali). This is why the followers of Caliphs of the Banu Umayyah attained greater benefits and graces in their religious and worldly affairs more than what has been attained by the followers of the (none existing) awaited Imam. This is because the Shia Rafidah do not have an Imam who is commanding them to do good, he never prohibit them from avoiding any evil and he never aid them in any of their religious and worldly affairs. This is in contrast to those (followers of the Caliphs of Banu Umayyah) who have attained many benefits through their leaders in both their religious and worldly affairs in greater measure than is attained by Shia through their leaders.

Thus, it is clear if the argument that ascribing themselves to the Shia of Ali is correct, then the argument of those ascribing themselves to Shia of Uthman more deserved to be correct and if it is false then that one is falser. If Shia have agreed with Ahlus Sunnah that the certitude of those people of success by giving their leaders absolute, unquestionable obedience is wrong and misguidance, then surely

the incorrectness and misguidance of the Shia of being certain of success because they are obeying the person who is claiming to be deputy of the infallible Imam – and the infallible is nowhere to be found – is greater and greater. Surely Shia do not have leaders with authority who are giving them directives except their scholars who are eating the property of people wrongly, unjustly and hindering them from the path of Allah.

Secondly, this type of example can be correct if two premises are affirmed: 1. If we have an infallible Imam (in existence). 2. That he has commanded such and such. Both premises are not known; nay they are false. Forget about the first premise. Nay, forget about the second premise. Surely, the Imams that they are claiming are infallible have died a long time ago and the awaited one has disappeared more than four hundred and fifty years ago (today more than one thousand and two hundred years ago), to others he is none existent and has never been created. Therefore, those who are being obeyed are scholars among the scholars of Shia Rafidah or some books that have been written by some scholars, wherein they mentioned that what it contained has been taken from those infallibles and the scholars who wrote those books are not infallible by consensus and it is not certain whether they will be successful.

Therefore, Shia Rafidah are only following leaders upon whom they are not certain about their neither success nor their felicity; they are neither certain about the success of their scholars who are directing them with what to do and what to avoid and those are their leaders. Shia scholars by affiliating themselves to those Imams are like many of those who followed sages (Sheikhs) who affiliated themselves to a sage (Sheikh) who has died long ago and they do not know his command or his prohibitions. Nay, they just have followers whose wealth they are consuming unjustly and they hindered them from the path of Allah. They teach them extremism with regard to those Sheikhs and their successors and take them as lords beside Allah; this is the way Shia scholars command their followers, and this the way Christians scholars command their followers; they are commanding them to associate partners with Allah and to worship

other than Allah. Surely, the meaning of Tauhid (Oneness of Allah) is that we worship none but Allah, we do not call upon other than Allah, we do not fear other than Him. We do not seek refuge in other than Him, we do not rely but on Him and the religion is for none other than Him; it is not for anyone among His creatures. And that we shall not take Angels and Prophets as lords beside Allah. Then how can we take Imams, Sheikhs, scholars, rulers and other people as lords beside Allah?

The messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is conveying the message of Allah concerning the allowed and the prohibited and thus, no one can be given an absolute obedience other than Allah. When an Imam or a Sheikh is treated like a god; he is called upon although he is absent or after his death, his aids and help are sought and they sought from them necessities. Obedience for a person who is present commanding what he likes and prohibiting what he like; they likened the dead (scholar or Sheikh) to Allah and liken the living to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and thus they shot out of the reality of Islam, whose basis and main principle are bearing witness that no one has the right to be worshipped but Allah and bearing witness that Muhammad (s.a.w) is the Messenger of Allah.

Most of them are holding firmly to stories and myths that are conveyed from the Sheikh and most of it are lies against him and some of it are his mistakes; with these they abandon sound narrations from the infallible speaker (Messenger of Allah) and hold to unsound narrations from fallible speakers. Therefore, if those people have mistaken in this, then Shia have erred the more and fallen into greater mistake; because they are the greatest liars regarding what they are narrating on the authority of Imams and they are greater in extremism because they claimed infallibility of Imams.

Thirdly, it is imperative to reject the verdict of this example that he gave and made it a basis for his analogy (Qiyas). This is because if one of the men said to the man: My path is secure and it will take me to my destination and the other man said to him: I do not know whether my path is secure and whether it can take me to my

destination or the first person said it. The intellect will not necessitate accepting the words of the first man just because of what he said. Nay, it is possible for those with sense and intellect to think that he is a swindler who is planning against him; he is inducing him with lies so that he can follow him on that path in order to kill him and plunder his wealth and it is possible that he is ignorant (of the way); he does not know what is on that path of dangers and insecurity. With regard to the other man; he did not guarantee anything to the questioner for he just refereed him to his intellect and right sense of judgment. The best thing for a person to do in this type of situation is to consider carefully which of the two paths is the best to follow; one of those two paths or entirely another path!!!

With these it is clear that mere certainty of a person does not show knowledge of that particular person or his truthfulness and that stopping and holding back until the evidence is clear is the tradition of sensible men and those with intellect.

Fourthly, we reply to his statement: "They (Shia) are certain of success for themselves with the exclusion of Ahlus Sunnah." This is a lie: If he means by that whoever believe the like of their beliefs will enter Paradise even if he shunned all the obligations and commit all the prohibited; this is not the words of the Imamiyyah and any sane man cannot say that. And if the love of Ali is a good act that cannot be harmed by committing evils; thus abandoning prayers cannot harm him, neither committing illegal sexual intercourse nor achieving his goals through spilling the blood of innocent human beings; if he loves Ali. [\[63\]](#)

If they say: True love entailed agreeing with the beloved (in his words and conducts); then the matter has been referred back to the necessity of carrying out the obligations and avoiding the prohibited. If he means by that they believed that whoever has a sound faith, carry out the obligations and abandon the prohibited will enter Paradise; then this is the belief of Ahlus Sunnah. Undoubtedly, they are sure and certain that whoever fears Allah will enter Paradise as stated by the Qur'an. Ahlus Sunnah only stops on a particular

person for they have no knowledge of his belonging to those who fear Allah, but if it is known that he died as a pious person who fears Allah, it is known that he is of the denizens of Paradise. And this why they give testimony of entering Paradise to whoever the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) say that he is among the denizens of Paradise; and they have two views concerning a person who is generally praised with good among people.

With these it is clear that there is no correct certainty among Shia Imamiyyah which is particular to them only and which Ahlus Sunnah are an exception. And if they say: We are certain that whoever we see carrying out the commandment and avoiding evils, that he will enter Paradise without being informed about what is in his heart by the infallible. We reply: This issue is not exclusive to Shia Imamiyyah, nay if there is a correct path to that, then it belongs to Ahlus Sunnah; and they follow the correct path diligently. If there is no any correct path to that, then that is nothing but making statement without knowledge and there is no virtue in it, nay virtue is in not making the statement.

Summarily, whenever they claimed sound knowledge, Ahlus Sunnah more deserved it and whatever they claimed of ignorance; it is a defect and Ahlus Sunnah are the farthest away from it.

Fifthly, Ahlus Sunnah are more certain of the success of their Imam (leaders) than Shia Rafidah. This is because their Imams after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) are those who embraced Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar, and they are sure and certain that those people are successful. They bear testimony that the ten companions that have been promised Paradise are of the denizens of Paradise, they bear testimony that Allah has said to all those who participated in the battle of Badr (in a hadith Qudsi): ***“Do whatever you like I have forgiven you.”*** Nay, they are saying that certainly: ***“None of those who gave the vow of allegiance – to the Messenger of Allah – under the tree will enter Hell Fire” (Bukhari and Muslim)*** – for it has been ascertained that the Messenger of Allah said that – and those people numbered more than one thousand four hundred

Imams of the Ahlus Sunnah; they bear witness that none of them will enter Hell-Fire and this a testimony based on knowledge as has been confirmed by the Book (Qur'an) and Sunnah.

Sixthly, we say: Ahlus Sunnah are sure of success either generally or specifically particularly; and this is a testimony that is based on knowledge in contrast to Shia Rafidah because if they give testimony they testify on what they have no knowledge or they testify with false testimony; a testimony in which they knew that they are lying. They are as described by Imam Shafi'i: "I have never seen a people greater in giving false testimony than Rafidah."

Seventhly, the Imam that Shia Rafidah testify to his being successful is either obeyed in everything even if he is contested by others among the believers or he is obeyed in what he command of obedience to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), and what he stated out of his Ijtihad (effort to deduce laws from its primary sources) if he did not know that someone else deserved making Ijtihad more than him and the like. If the Imam is covered by the first description, then Ahlus Sunnah do not have an Imam with this description except the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). And they are saying: - as is stated by Mujahid, al-Hakim and Imam Malik etc. - "the statement of each and every person can be accepted or rejected except that of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)." They give testimony that their Imam is the best of all created beings and they give testimony that whoever follows him; do what he commanded and abandoned what he prohibited will enter Paradise. This testimony compared with your own; it is clear that it is better than that of Shia Rafidah, for Rafidah are giving testimony that whoever follows and obeys the Askariyain (their tenth and eleventh Imams) and those similar to them will enter Paradise. Thus, it is affirmed that the Imam of Ahlus Sunnah is more perfect and there testimony for him and for themselves if they obeyed him is more perfect and there is nothing other than that.

It shall be noted that Allah the Exalted said: **"... Is Allah better, or (all) that you ascribe as partners (to Him)?" (Of course, Allah is**

Better)” (27:59). Thus during debate absolute good is compared to absolute evil although there isn’t any good in absolute evil.

If Shia Rafidah means by Imam a particular person, then Ahlus Sunnah do not obligate obedience to him if what he command is not in agreement with the commands of the absolute Imam, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). And if they obey him (that Imam) in what Allah directed that he shall be obeyed; in this instance they are obeying Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w); therefore, their stopping in giving verdict concerning a particular Imam do no harm to them; whether he is of the denizens of Paradise or not?

Eighthly, we say: Surely Allah has guaranteed success and felicity to whoever obeys Him and obey His Messenger (s.a.w) and He promised damnation to whoever does not do that; thus, cause of happiness and success is obeying Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). Allah the Exalted said: **“And whoso obeys Allah and the Messenger (Muhammad SAW), then they will be in the company of those on whom Allah has bestowed His Grace, of the Prophets, the Siddiqun (those followers of the Prophets who were first and foremost to believe in them, like Abu Bakr As-Siddiq radhiallahu'anhu), the martyrs, and the righteous; And how excellent these companions are!” (4:69).** There are similar verses and if the affair is like that, then surely Allah has commanded that: **“So keep your duty to Allah and fear Him as much as you can...” (64:16).** Thus whoever exert effort in obeying Allah in accordance to his ability is a denizen of Paradise.

The statement of the Rafidi that no one will enter Paradise except if he is an adherent of Shia Imamiyyah is like the statement of the Jews and Christians when they said: **“And they say, ‘None shall enter Paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian.’ These are their own desires. Say (O Muhammad Peace be upon him), ‘Produce your proof if you are truthful.’ Yes, but whoever submits his face (himself) to Allah (i.e. follows Allah's Religion of Islamic Monotheism) and he is a Muhsin (good-doer i.e. performs good deeds totally for Allah's sake only without any**

show off or to gain praise or fame, etc., and in accordance with the Sunnah of Allah's Messenger Muhammad Peace be upon him) then his reward is with his Lord (Allah), on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve” (2:111-112).

It is well known that it is not obligatory upon anybody to obey the awaited Imam that Shia Rafidah is claiming and nobody has brought forth any word from him. Therefore, whoever obeyed the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) will enter Paradise even if he does not believe in this Imam and he who believes in this Imam will not enter Paradise until he obeys the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Thus, obeying the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is the pivot of attaining felicity or otherwise and it is the distinguisher between the denizens of Paradise and the denizens of Hell-Fire and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has distinguished between people and Allah the Most High has showed and directed His slave to His obedience through what He has taught them; thus it is clear that Ahlus Sunnah are certain with success and felicity to those who are of the Ahlus Sunnah.

SEGMENT: ON SHIA RAFIDAH CLAIM THAT THEY TOOK THEIR CREED FROM THE INFALLIBLES

The Rafidi stated: “Fourthly: Shia Imamiyyah take their creed from infallible Imams who are known to be men of virtues, knowledge, piety, and are abstemious; they are known to preoccupy themselves all the time with acts of worship, supplications, reading the Qur’an continuously, since their childhood to the end of their lives. Among them are those who taught people sciences and it is with regard to them that the chapter seventy six (Insan) of the Qur’an was revealed, so also the verse of purification, obligation of loving (them), the verse of mutual imprecation etc. and Imam Ali used to pray in each day and night one thousand units of prayers, and recite the Qur’an although he has been tried with intense warfare and Jihad.

The first of them is Ali bin Abi Talib, who is the best of creation after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Allah joined his soul with that of the Messenger of Allah when He said: ‘... **Ourselves and yourselves...**’ (3:61). The Messenger of Allah took him as a friend and gave him his daughter in marriage. His virtues are not hidden, a lot of miracles happened through him to the extent that some people claimed that he is god and he killed them; some other Shia sects such as the extremists and Nusairiyyah followed their claims (footsteps). His children are the grand children of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), leaders of youths of Paradise and have been appointed as Imams by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). They are the most abstemious men and the most knowledgeable in their time and they fought Jihad in the path of Allah until they were killed. Hasan wore wool under his expensive cloths without anyone knowing that. And on that day the Messenger of Allah took Husain and placed him on his right thigh and placed Ibrahim on his left thigh and at that moment Angel Gabriel descended and said: Allah will not join those two for you, so choose one among them. The Messenger of Allah said: If Husain die, I, Fatima and Ali will weep for him and if Ibrahim die, I am the only one who will weep for him. So he chose the death of Ibrahim and he died after three days and whenever Husain come

to him after that he will kiss him and say: Welcome to the one who I saved his soul with my son Ibrahim.

Ali bin Husain, Zainul Abideen used to fast in the days and the nights, recite the Book of Allah, pray every day and night one thousand units of prayer. He supplicate in each unit of prayer with supplications that are taken from his parents and his own, then he will put away the booklet like a distressed person and say: How can I be able to copy the worship of Ali!! He used to cry too much to the extent that the sign of tears was imprinted on his cheeks. He used to prostrate for too long until he was called the one with mark of prayer and the Messenger of Allah named him leader of the worshippers. Hisham bin Abdul Malik went on a pilgrimage and he was not able to kiss the black stone due to intense crowd but when Zainul Abideen arrive people made space for him and he was able to kiss it to the extent of being alone before the black stone. Hisham bin Abdul Malik asked: Who is this? And Farzadeq replied him saying – he mentioned the known poetic verses - . Imam Zainul Abideen sent to Farzadeq one thousand Dinar but he did not accept it saying: I said what I said in anger to Allah and His Messenger, so I do not take payment for it. Ali bin Husain said to him: Whatever left us, we members of the Prophet's family, will not return to us. So Farzadeq accepted it. There was in Madina some men who used to get their sustenance in the night and they do not know who is bringing it to them, when Zainul Abideen died the supply stopped and that is when they realized that the supplies have been coming from him.

His son Muhammad Baqir is one of the greatest abstemious and worship. Prostrating opened a cleave in his forehead and he is the most knowledgeable of the people of his time, the Messenger of Allah named him Al-Baqir (one with the cleaved forehead). One day Jabir bin Abdullah al-Ansari went to him while he is studying in a school for children and said to him: Your grandfather, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is greeting you with peace. He replied: may peace be on my grandfather. It was said to Jabir: How is he? He replied: I was sitting before the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and Husain was on his lap while he is playing with him. He said: O Jabir, a child will be born

for him whose name is Ali and on the Day of Judgment a caller will call out: Let the leader of the worshippers stand up and his son will stand up and then he will beget a son whose name will be Muhammad Baqir , he will be immense in knowledge, so if you see him give him my salutation of peace. Abu Hanifa and others narrated this narration.

His son Sadiq is the best of the people of his time and more pious. The scholars of biography said: He was engrossed in worship from seeking for power and authority. Umar bin Abi Miqdam said: Whenever I look at Ja'afar bin Muhammad as-Sadiq I comprehend that he is of the offspring of Prophets. He is the one who taught the jurisprudence of Imamiyyah, true sciences and correct religious principles. And whatever he predicts used to occur and that is why he was named as-Sadiq al-Ameen (the truthful, the trust worthy).

Abdullah bin Hasan gathered the elders of the offspring of Imam Ali (r.a) in order to take vow of allegiance for them. Sadiq said: This affair cannot be accomplished. He became angry due to that and he say: The one wearing the yellow cap will be the Caliph, pointing to Mansur. When Mansur heard that he was happy because he knew the prediction of Sadiq will occur and that he will become a Caliph. When he run away, he used to say where is the prediction of your truthful one (meaning Sadiq) and in the end he became the Caliph.

His son Musa Khazim is called the pious slave, and he is the greatest worshipper at his time, he used to pray throughout the night and fast during the day. He was called Khazim because if he is informed about a person who do wrong to him he will send money to him. Both the proponents and the opponents narrate his virtues. Ibn al-Jawzi of the Hanbalites said: It was narrated from Shaiq al-Balkhi who said: I was on my way to Makka for pilgrimage in the year 148AH and I stopped at Qadisiyyah. I saw a young handsome youth whose face is dark brown, wearing wool clothes that are tied with a belt, wearing shoes and he is seated away from people. I said in myself: This youth is one of the ascetics he want to be a liability to people, by Allah I will go to him and censure him. When I get close to

him he said: O Shaqiq avoid a lot of thoughts for some thoughts are sinful. I said to myself this is a pious slave of Allah, he has spoken what is in my mind, I will go to him and ask him to forgive me. He was out of my view and when we stopped at Waqisah, I found him praying, his body is shaking and his tears are flowing. I said to myself let me go to him and seek for his forgiveness, when I get close to him, he stopped praying and said to me: O Shaqiq **“And verily, I am indeed Forgiving to him who repents, believes (in My Oneness, and associates none in worship with Me) and does righteous good deeds, and then remains constant in doing them, (till his death)” (20:82).** I said this is one of the Abdal, he has spoken my secret twice. When we stopped at Zabalah I saw him standing before a well and in his hand is a bucket he want to drink water and it fall into the well, so he raised his hands in supplication: You are my Lord when I am thirsty and my strength when I need food, O my Lord I do not have any other bucket. Shaqiq said: By Allah I saw the water of the well rising until he was able to take his bucket, fill it, perform ablution and pray four units of prayer. He then picked some dust and he stated throwing it into the bucket and drinking the water and I said: Feed me with the remaining of that which Allah has sustained you or what He has blessed you with. He said: O Shaqiq there is always Allah’s blessing upon us whether we know it or not, therefore think good of your Lord. He then gave me the bucket and I drank from it and it was Sugar and Suwaiq (a kind of mush made of wheat and barley), I never drank anything sweeter than it nor anything with sweeter scent, until I am satisfied. I remained for days not feeling thirsty or hungry. I never see him again after that until I entered Makka. I saw him one night praying with full attentiveness to his Lord and crying and he continued in that state until the night passed. When the day break he sat in his position glorifying Allah, then he stood up and prayed the Morning Prayer. He circumambulated the House of Allah for one week and then he went out of the mosque and I followed. I found that he has many followers, a lot of wealth and slaves in contrast to his situation on his way to Makka. People surrounded him greeting and seeking blessings and I asked them: Who is that? They replied Musa bin Ja’afar. I said: I am

surprised about those mysteries but for the like of this progeny of the Prophet. This has been narrated by Hanbali.

It is through him that Bishr al-Hafy repented for one day he passed by a house in Bagdad and heard noises and sound of music coming out of that house. A slave maid come out carrying a basket of refuse and threw it on the road. He said to her: O maid! Is the owner of this house a free man or a slave? She replied: Nay, he is a free man. He said you have spoken the truth for if he is a slave he will fear his master. When the maid returned, her master who is on a table of intoxicants asked her: What make you come back late? She replied: A man spoke to me about so and so. Thereafter he went out without shoes and met our master Musa bin Ja'afar and repented at his hands."

Answers to the above contentions are from many perspectives: Firstly, we say: We do not agree with the contention that Shia Imamiyyah took their creed from Ahlul Bayt (progeny or family of the Prophet): neither Shia Imamiyyah nor other Shia sects. Nay, they have contradicted Imam Ali (r.a) and the scholars of Ahlul Bayt in all their principles of religion in which they have contradicted Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah. (They have contradicted them) in their concepts Tauhid (Oneness of Allah), justice, and Imamah. This is because what have been confirmed as coming from Imam Ali and the scholars of the Ahlul Bayt are confirming Allah's attributes and characteristics (without negating them), confirming Qadr, affirming the Caliphate of the first three Caliphs and affirming the precedence and superiority of Abubakar and Umar and other issues all of which contradicted the creed of Rafidah. Sound hadiths and narrations (that support our assertions) are uncountable regarding that in the books of scholars in such a way that having full knowledge of the narrations on these matters from the scholars of Ahlul Bayt necessitates certainty that Shia Rafidah have contradicted them and are not agreeing with them.

Secondly: We say: It is well known that Shia have differed too much (among themselves) on the issues of Imamah, Allah's attributes,

Qadr and other issues of their principles of religion; therefore which among those statements are taken from infallible Imams: Even on the issue of Imamah their contradictions and disagreements are well known:

We have mentioned their differences on textual appointments of Imams and on the issue of awaited Mahdi, for instance here are some of their difference on the issues of Imam Mahdi (each sect is saying that one of these men is still alive, he is hiding somewhere and one day he will appear as the Imam Mahdi): Some of them said Ja'afar bin Muhammad is the Mahdi and he is still alive, some of them say Musa bin Ja'afar and he is still alive, some of them say Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hasan and he is still alive, some of them say Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah and he is still alive etc.

With regard to appointment as the next Imam through will they have also differed greatly: Some of them say Imam Ali has made will in favor of Hasan and Husain and another sect are saying he made will in favor of Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah. A sect of Shia are saying that Ali bin Husain made will in favor of his son Abi Ja'afar, another sect says he made will in favor of his son Abdullah and yet another group say he made will in favor of Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hasan bin Hasan. A sect say Ja'afar made a will in favor of his son Isma'il and yet another sect are saying, no he made will in favor of Muhammad bin Isma'il, others say to Muhammad, others say to Abdullah and yet another sect say the will is made in favor of his son Musa. A sect says there is text on the appointment of Muhammad bin Hasan, yet another sect says the text is made for Bani 'Ubaidullah bin Maimun al-Qaddah al-Hakim and his companions, while another group are saying that the text is in favor of Banu Hashim and direct to Banu Abbas.

It is impossible that all these contradictory statements emanated from an infallible. Therefore, their words are false; that their creeds are taken from an infallible.

Thirdly: We say: Let us assume that Imam Ali (r.a) is infallible. If these are the contradictions in Shia creed and they have differed all

those differences; how can we determine the soundness of some of those statements as emanating from Ali (r.a) over other counter statements (of the other Shia sect) while at the same time each sect is claiming that their creed is taken from the infallible!!! It shall be noted that Shia do not have chains of narrators (chains of authorities) so that the chains can be studied in order to find the truthfulness of its men or otherwise. Nay, they are just broken up chains of narrators from a group that is known to lie too much and has too many contradictions in its narrations. Can any sane person trust that?^[64] If a group of the Shia claimed that there are concurrent reports from this Imam making will for that Imam and this one making will for that one; these claims can be contradicted by the claims of other Shia groups who also made appeal to the same concurrent narrations (from an infallible Imam). Undoubtedly, if all those who are talking of textual appointment make this type of claim, one cannot be able to distinguished between the claimants.

All these replies and explanations showed that even if we assume that Imam Ali (r.a) is infallible, then their creeds are not taken from him. The same type of infallibility they are claiming for Imam Ali is made by the Christians concerning the lordship of Prophet Jesus (a.s), although what they are practicing is not what he has taught.

Fourthly, Shia requires two premises to support their creed: The first one; the infallibility of those they are ascribing infallibility to them among the Imams. Secondly, confirming that the narrations emanated from the Imam. Both premises are null and false, this is because Jesus (a.s) is not god but an honored Prophet. If we assume that he is a god or an honored Prophet his words are true, but what the Christians are saying are not his words and that is why Imam Ali (r.a) has some similarities with Prophet Jesus (a.s); some people went to the extreme regarding him and take him above his status and other people relegated him below his status, as the Jews have done. Those people are saying concerning Jesus: He is a god and these people are saying he is an unbeliever, an impostor, an illegal son. The same thing with Imam Ali (r.a): Those people are

saying that he is god and these people are saying: He is an unbeliever, an unjust man.

Fifthly, we say: Undoubtedly, there are a lot of virtues and outstanding traits of Imam Ali, Hasan, Husain, Ali bin Husain, his son Muhammad and Ja'afar bin Muhammad which have been attested to and which this Rafidi writer has not mentioned. Instead of that he mentioned things that exposed and showed the ignorance of the one who mentioned it. An example is his stating that Chapter seventy six (Insan) of the Qur'an has been revealed concerning them while this Chapter has been revealed in Makka by consensus of all scholars. And Ali married Fatima in Madina after migration, his son Hasan was born in the third year after immigration to Madina while Husain was born in the fourth year; that is a number of years after revelation of this Chapter. Therefore, for anybody to say it was revealed concerning them he is telling an apparent lie which is very clear, and known to whoever has knowledge of science of revelation of the Qur'an and the condition of those honored people.

With regard to the verse of purification; know that the verse is not giving information about their being cleansed and that abomination has been removed from them, but rather it is commanding them to do what will lead to their being cleansed and being protected from abominations. The words of Allah the Most High: **"... Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification (33:33).** And He said: **"... Allah does not want to place you in difficulty, but He wants to purify you, and to complete His Favor on you that you may be thankful" (5:6).** In another verse Allah said: **"Allah wishes to make clear (what is lawful and what is unlawful) to you, and to show you the ways of those before you, and accept your repentance, and Allah is AllKnower, AllWise. Allah wishes to accept your repentance, but those who follow their lusts, wish that you (believers) should deviate tremendously away from the Right Path. Allah wishes to lighten (the burden) for you; and man was created weak (cannot be patient to leave sexual intercourse**

with woman)” (4:26-28). The wish (of Allah) here contained commands, love and being pleased with, and thus it is not a wish that entailed the occurrence of what is needed, for if that is the case, it entailed that Allah has cleansed all those He wish they are clean; and this statement on the basis of those Shia Qadriyyah is sounder. According to their creed: Allah wish what will not occur and what He does not want to happen can occur.

So the words of Allah: “... **Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet), and to purify you with a thorough purification (33:33);** if this is attained through doing what they are commanded to do and avoiding what they are prohibited from doing. Then, the issue is hinged upon wish and action; if they perform what they are commanded and shun what they are prohibited they will be cleansed and if not, then no.

Shia Rafidah are saying: Allah did not create their actions and He cannot be able to cleanse them and remove from them abomination. In contrast to that those who believe in Qadr (i.e. Ahlus Sunnah) are saying: Allah is able to do that; if he motivated them to do what He has commanded and shun what He has prohibited from doing; cleansings and removal of abomination will be attained.

What will show to you that this is of the issues upon which they are commanded to act and not what they have been informed have happened, is the sound hadith of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), in which it is stated that he covered Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain in a garment and then he supplicated thus: **“O Allah those are my members of my family, remove from them abomination and cleanse them with a through cleansing” (Muslim, Tirmidhi, Ahmad).** This hadith has contradicted the belief of Shia Rafidah and their submission in two ways: Firstly, the Messenger of Allah prayed and supplicated to Allah to cleanse them and purify them and this proved that the verse did not inform that, that has happened; if to say that they have been cleansed and purified, the Messenger of Allah would have glorified Allah and thank Him for His favor and not

confine himself to supplicating for it. Secondly, this showed that Allah can be able to remove abomination from them and to purify them and this showed that He is the Creator of the actions of His slaves.

Among the proof that the verse contained commands and prohibitions are the words of Allah in the context of the verse and its setting: **“O wives of the Prophet! Whoever of you commits an open illegal sexual intercourse, the torment for her will be doubled, and that is ever easy for Allah. And whosoever of you is obedient to Allah and His Messenger SAW , and does righteous good deeds, We shall give her, her reward twice over, and We have prepared for her Rizqan Karima (a noble provision Paradise). O wives of the Prophet! You are not like any other women. If you keep your duty (to Allah), then be not soft in speech, lest he in whose heart is a disease (of hypocrisy, or evil desire for adultery, etc.) should be moved with desire, but speak in an honourable manner. And stay in your houses, and do not display yourselves like that of the times of ignorance, and perform As-Salat (IqamatasSalat), and give Zakat and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification. And remember (O you the members of the Prophet's family, the Graces of your Lord), that which is recited in your houses of the Verses of Allah and AlHikmah (i.e. Prophet's Sunnah legal ways, etc. so give your thanks to Allah and glorify His Praises for this Quran and the Sunnah). Verily, Allah is Ever Most Courteous, WellAcquainted with all things” (33:30-34).** This context and setting showed clearly commands to do and prohibitions on not to do, it also showed that the wives of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) are his family and household members for it is addressing them, it also showed that the words of Allah: : **“... Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification (33:33),** includes those who are not his wives such as Ali, Fatima. Hasan and Husain

because He mentioned this part of the verse in masculine form when both masculine and feminine are addressed.^[65] Those people were given preference (in mention by the Messenger of Allah) of being the more deserved to be members of his family than his wives and that is why he specifically supplicated for them and covered them with a garment. In like manner as the mosque at Quba was established upon piety, the Prophets mosque (in Madina) was also established upon piety and is the most perfect on that issue. When Allah the Most High revealed: **“...Verily, the mosque whose foundation was laid from the first day on piety is more worthy that you stand therein (to pray). In it are men who love to clean and to purify themselves. And Allah loves those who make themselves clean and pure” (9:108)**, concerning the mosque of Quba, but the words encompassed the mosque of Quba and his mosque which more deserved that (description).

The contention of this Rafidi that the verse of “loving kindness” was revealed concerning them is a mistake. It come in sound hadith from Sa'id bin Jubair that Ibn Abbas was asked concerning the words of Allah: **“... Say (O Muhammad SAW): ‘No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you’” (42:23)**, *Sa'id bin Jubayr said, “To be kind to the family of Muhammad.” Ibn `Abbas said, “No, you have jumped to a hasty conclusion. There was no clan among Quraish to whom the Prophet did not have some ties of kinship.” Ibn `Abbas said, “Except that you uphold the ties of kinship that exist between me and you” (Bukhari, Ahmad).*^[66]

Ibn Abbas (r.a) is one of the grand scholars of the Prophet's family and the most knowledgeable among them with Qur'anic exegeses and this is a confirmed explanation of the verse from him. That is further explained because the verse did not say: “Except loving kindness to my kinship,” but it said: “Except for my kinship with you.” Did not you see that when Allah the Most High spoke about his kinship He said: **“And know that whatever of war-booty that you may gain, verily one-fifth (1/5th) of it is assigned to Allah, and to**

the Messenger, and to the near relatives [of the Messenger (Muhammad)]...” (8:41). Linguistically, it cannot be said; “loving in kinship,” but it is said; “loving for kinship.” Then how can you say that when the Qur’an said: “... **except to be kind to me for my kinship with you!**” It is further explained that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), do not ask for payment or recompense for conveying Allah’s message for his reward is with Allah. It is incumbent for Muslims to love family of the Prophet (s.a.w), but that is proved with other textual evidences and not this one and our love for them is not a payment for the Prophet (s.a.w) in anything. In addition to that this verse was revealed in Makka, at that time Imam Ali (r.a) has not married Fatima (r.a), and he did not beget children.

With regard to the verse of mutual imprecation, when it was revealed the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) took the hands of Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain so that he can take the oath with them. He made that specific to them because they are closer to him than the rest of his family for he does not have a male child at that time with whom he can go together with him, but he used to say with regard to Hasan: **“This my child is a master.”** Therefore, they are his children and women because none of his female children exist at that time other than Fatima (r.a). The episode of mutual imprecation took place when a delegation of Christians comes from Najran and that was after the conquest of Makka (specifically the ninth year after migration). This verse is showing their perfect kinship with the Messenger of Allah and hadith of the garment is showing the same thing; but this does not mean that one of them is better than the rest of the believers or he is more knowledgeable than them, for virtue is with perfection of belief and righteousness and not by nearness in kinship.

Allah the Most High has said: **“O mankind! We have created you from a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know one another. Verily, the most honourable of you with Allah is that (believer) who has At-Taqla [i.e. one of the Muttaqun (pious). Verily, Allah is All-Knowing, All-Aware” (49:13).** It has been attested by the Book of Allah and Sunnah that

Abubakar is the most pious person in the Muslim community and concurrent narrations come on the authority of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) that he said: ***“...Were I to choose anyone as my bosom friend, I would have chosen Abubakar as my dear friend, but (for him) I cherish Islamic brotherliness and love...”*** (Bukhari, Muslim). And this has been explained in detail in its right place (in this book).

With regard to what the Rafidi mentioned that Imam Ali (r.a) used to pray in each day and night one thousand units of prayer. This showed his ignorance about virtue in addition to his ignorance of reality. With regard to the first assertion: This is not a virtue, because it comes in sound hadith that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) does not increase in his night supererogatory prayers on thirteen units of prayer (Bukhari, Muslim). The Messenger of Allah also said: ***“... And the most beloved prayer to Allah was the prayer of David who used to sleep for (the first) half of the night and pray for 1/3 of it and (again) sleep for a sixth of it”*** (Bukhari, Muslim etc.).

The assertion of this Rafidi that Imam Ali (r.a) is the best of Allah's creation after the Messenger of Allah is just a mere claim in which he is countered by the generality of the Muslims both the predecessors and those who come after them.

The assertion of the Rafidi that Allah made his (Ali) person part of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) when He said: ***“... And ourselves and your selves...”*** and took him as his friend. We say in reply: That the hadith of befriending, is false and fabricated for the Messenger of Allah did not befriend anyone and he did not make friend between a Muhajir and a Muhajir or between an Ansar and an Ansar, but he made friends between Muhajirun and Ansar, just as he made Sa'ad bin Rabi'e and Abdurrahman bin 'Auf friends, made friend between Salman al-Farisi and Abu Dardaa as it has been narrated in sound hadith. With regard to his statement: ***“... And ourselves and your selves...”***; this is like the words of Allah: ***“Why then, did not the believers, men and women, when you heard it (the slander) think good of their own people and say: ‘This***

(charge) is an obvious lie?’’ (3:61). It was revealed concerning the story of slander with regard to Aisha (r.a); surely one of the believers is part of the believers, both men and women. With regard to being married to Fatima (r.a), then that is one of the virtues of Ali (r.a), just like marriage of Uthman (r.a) to two of his children is also his virtues and that is why he is called Dhun Nurain. Again, his (Messenger of Allah) marriage to the daughter of Abubakar and the daughter of Umar (r.a) are virtues for them; all the four Caliphs are his in laws – may Allah be pleased with them.

With regard the words of the Rafidi: He has displayed many miracles. We reply: Imam Ali (r.a) is better than many people that displayed some miracles and performance of miracles have been concurrently reported with regard to many among the generality of Ahlus Sunnah who are giving preference to Abubakar and Umar over Ali. Then why shall miracle not be affirmed with regard to Ali? Just performance of miracles does not show that he is better than other people.

The Rafidi stated: To the extent that some people claimed that he god. We reply: This is a statement of a compound ignorant person for many reasons. Firstly; the miracles of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) are many and greater by far measure but nobody among his companions claimed that he is a god. Secondly, the miracles of Prophets Abraham and Moses (a.s) are greater but nobody claimed that they are gods. Thirdly, the miracles of our Prophet (s.a.w) and those of Prophet Moses (a.s) are greater by far measures and nobody claimed that they are gods, the way Prophet Jesus (a.s) is claimed to be god by the Christians. Fourthly, Jesus (a.s) was claimed to be a god more than Muhammad, Abraham and Moses and that did not show that he is better than them or that his miracles are more overwhelming. Fifthly, the claimed divinity bestowed on Imam Ali (by Shia) is a false claim opposed by another false claims, which are the claims of the Jews with regard to Prophet Jesus (a.s) and the claims of Kharijites against Imam Ali (r.a); this is because the Khawarij excommunicated Ali from Islam and thus if it is permitted to say: His divinity was claimed due to the strength of ambiguity. It will

be permitted to say: They claimed his unbelief due to the strength of ambiguity and it will be permitted to say he committed some sins which made the Kharijites to excommunicate him from Islam.

The Kharijites are better, more sensible and more religious than those who claimed that he is a god. If it is permitted to argue with this type (of insensibility) and made it a virtue; then the claims of those who erected enmity against him and the claims of Kharijites that faulted him are stronger. How can one compare Kharijites to extreme Shia? Kharijites are the greatest people in observing prayers, fasting and reading the Qur'an and they have armies and soldiers and they are adherents of the religion of Islam inwardly and outwardly, in contrast to Shia Ghulat (extremists) who are either one of the most ignorant people or the most ardent unbelievers among mankind. Shia extremists are unbelievers by consensus of scholars, but nobody is excommunicating Kharijites from Islam except those who are excommunicating Shia Imamiyyah from Islam, for Kharijites are better than Shia Imamiyyah and Imam Ali (r.a) never excommunicated them from Islam and he never command that anyone of them who has been captured or overpowered shall be killed, in like manner that he commanded Shia extremists to be burnt. Nay, he never fought them until when they killed Abdullah bin Khabbab (r.a) and started attacking travellers.

Therefore, by consensus of Muslims: Imam Ali, all Prophet's companions and scholars, the Kharijites are better than Shia extremists. So if it is right for Shia Rafidah to employ the claims (and creed) of Shia extremists that Ali (r.a) is divine; a god as a proof of his virtues, then it will be right for Shia of Uthman (the Syrians who claimed to be fighting to avenge his murder) to advance the claims of the Kharijites that he is an unbeliever more deservedly: Thus it is known that this argument can only be advanced by the ignorant and also it is against him (the Rafidi) and not in his favor. This is one of the reason why people say that Shia Rafida are the greatest liars and more ignorant than Nawasib.

With regard to this Rafidi's assertion: "And his two children, the grandchildren of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) are masters of the youths of Paradise; they are two Imams by textual designation of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)."

We reply stating: What has been affirmed from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is that he said concerning Hasan (r.a): **"Surely this son of mine is a master, and Allah will bring peace through him between two great parties of Muslims"** (Bukhari, Abu Dawud).^[67]

It is also confirmed that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) used to place him and Usama bin Zaid on his thigh and supplicate: **"O Allah I love them, so love them and love whoever love them"** (Ahmad). This showed that what Hasan has done of abandoning fighting for the sake of Imamah (power and authority), intending to bring peace and rectitude among Muslims was a loved action that is loved by Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). And that it was not a calamity, nay it is an action loved by Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) over Muslims fighting each other and that is why he loved him and loved Usama bin Zaid (r.a) and supplicated for them because both of them hates fighting in the tribulation (the Muslims civil war). With regard to Usama bin Zaid; he never get involved in the fighting neither on the side of Ali (r.a) nor on the side of Mu'awiyah (r.a) and Imam Hasan (r.a) has always been advising Imam Ali (r.a) to stop fighting. The opinion of Imam Hasan is in contrast to the stand of Shia Rafida for they considered the peace treaty as a calamity and an act of humiliation. If it is assumed that there is an infallible Imam whose obedience is obligatory and whoever assumed the leadership other than him his authority is false and rejected; fighting on the path of Allah cannot be conducted under him and prayer cannot be performed behind him; that peace treaty would have been the greatest calamity to befall the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) and it would entailed corruption of religion. In such a situation which virtue has Imam Hasan attained so that he can be praised concerning it? The greatest extent one can go in order to absolve him in such a situation is to excuse him for his inability to carry out the obligation of Jihad, but in contrast to that (Shia views) the

Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) considered Hasan regarding the peace treaty as an honored master (who has done a praiseworthy action), and he did not consider him a weak excused person. Imam Hasan has not been weaker to fight than Imam Husain, nay he has more ability and capability of fighting than Husain and Husain fought until he was killed. If what Husain has done is the best obligation then what Hasan did was abandoning obligation or is weak to carry out obligations. And if what Hasan has done is the best and more beneficial, then that entailed abandoning fighting is the best and more beneficial and that what Hasan has done is more loved by Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) than what other than him has done. Surely, Allah raises the grades of pious believers some of them above others and all of them are in Paradise – may Allah be pleased with them.

Again, if the Messenger of Allah has made them two Imams (leaders with power and authority in accordance to Shia claims), then they did not benefit from the will of Ali and Husain did not benefit from the will of Hasan in his favor.^[68] There is no doubt to the fact that Hasan and Husain are the beloved of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in this world. It come in a sound narration that he placed them together under a garment and supplicated thus: ***“O Allah those are members of my family, so remove from them abomination and purify them thoroughly.”*** He has prayed for them at the episode of mutual imprecation, they have many virtues and they are among the best of the believers. Concerning the assertion of the Rafidi that they are the most ascetics of their time; then this is a statement without proof. With regard to this Rafidi’s statement: “And they fought a great fight for the sake of Allah until they were killed.” We reply: This is a lie against them for Hasan relinquished authority and handed power to Mu’awiyah although he has behind him armies of Iraq; and he never prefer fighting Muslims as is known of his conducts and actions. With regard to his death; it has been speculated that he was poisoned and that was martyrdom for him and an honor; but he did not die as fighter (on the battle field).

Imam Husain (r.a) did not left for Iraq with the intension of fighting, but he thought that people will obey him and when he realized that they have abandoned him, he requested to be allowed to return to Hijaz (the Arabian peninsula - from where he come from)^[69] or to a frontier region or to be allowed to go and meet Yazid in Syria. But those unjust oppressors did not allow him to follow any of the options he gave and instead requested him to surrender himself so that he will be taken to Yazid as a captive and he refused to submit himself to them; he fought (in self-defense) until he was killed, a martyred; he never intended to start any fighting.

With regard to this Rafidi's assertion: That Imam Hasan wore woolen materials under his expensive cloths. The reply is that: This is similar to his statement concerning Ali; that he used to pray one thousand units of prayer; for there is no virtue in doing that and it is a lie. If wearing wool under cotton cloth etc. is a virtue the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) would have commanded his community to do that either by his words or his actions or that his companions would have been practicing that during his time. Since he did not practice that during his time and he did not encourage people to do that; it showed that there is no virtue in it; but the Messenger of Allah has clothed himself with a woolen garment above his cloth while on a journey.

With regard to the hadith forwarded by the Rafidi: "On that day the Messenger of Allah took Husain and placed him on his right thigh and placed Ibrahim on his left thigh and at that moment Angel Gabriel descended said: Allah will not join those two for you, so choose one among them. The Messenger of Allah said: If Husain die, I, Fatima and Ali will weep for him and if Ibrahim die, I am the only one who will weep for him. So he chooses death of Ibrahim and he died after three days and whenever Husain comes to him after that he will kiss him and say: Welcome to the one who I saved his soul with my son Ibrahim."

The reply is that: This hadith has not been narrated by any man of knowledge. No one knows its chain of reporters and it does not exist in any book of hadith. The man (this Rafidi) who quoted it did not

mention its chain of authority and he did not ascribe it to any book of hadith; he just mentioned it as it is his conduct of narrating unbridled and unchecked narrations. It is the standard that narrations cannot be differentiated, set apart and sieved by knowing its sound from its fabricated lies except by following the scientific methods that lead to that, otherwise a quotation is mere claim like any other claim. We again maintain that this hadith is a fabricated lie; it is a hadith of the ignorant for surely there is nothing greater to Allah in joining Ibrahim and Husain than joining Hasan and Husain in accordance to what the hadith is pointing to. If the death of Hasan or Husain is greater than the death of Ibrahim that entailed the existence of Hasan is greater than the existence of Ibrahim; both Hasan and Husain has remained.

SEGMENT: DISCUSSIONS ON ALI ZAINUL ABIDEEN, BAQIR AND AS-SADIQ

With regard to Ali bin Husain, he is among the grand Tabi'un^[70] and their foremost in knowledge and religious observances. Yahya bin Sa'id said: "He is the best among the descendants of the Messenger of Allah that I saw in Madina." Muhammad bin Sa'ad said: "He is reliable, truthful, and trustworthy, he narrated a lot of hadiths, he is remembered with good and is raised to a higher station and estimation." Yahaya bin Sa'id al-Ansari said: "I heard Ali bin Husain – and he is the best among the descendants of the Messenger of Allah that I met – saying: 'O people love us the love of Islam, for your love continued to be with us until it became a shame on us.'"

We reply that: With regard to what the Rafidi mentioned that he used to pray one thousand units of prayer, it has been explained that this is not possible but in a way that is detested in religion or it is not even possible and thus, this type of fairy tale shall not be mentioned among virtues and outstanding deeds. The Rafidi's claim that the Messenger of Allah named him the master of worshippers is a statement that has no basis and nobody has narrated that among men of knowledge and religion.

Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ali is one of the best men of scholarship and religion, it was said that he is called Baqir because he has dissected knowledge and not because of the cleft of prostration on his forehead. The claim that he is the most knowledgeable of his time requires proof, and Imam al-Zuhri is his contemporary and he is more knowledgeable than him in the estimation of people. Narrating that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) named him al-Baqir has no basis, nay it is one of the fabricated narrations in the estimation of scholars of hadith.

Imam Ja'afar as-Sadiq is one of the best men of knowledge and religion, Umar bin Abi Miqdam said: Whenever I look at Ja'afar as-Sadiq I knew that he is an offspring of Prophets. With regard to the statement of this Rafidi concerning him: "He occupied himself with

acts of worship and shunned power and authority.” We reply that: This is a clear contradiction from Shia Imamiyyah because according to them it is obligatory upon him to shoulder its responsibilities and discharge its duties and it is noted that there is no Imam during his time other than him. Thus, carrying out this great responsibility; if it obligatory, is better than occupying himself with supererogatory acts of worship.

With regard to this Rafidi’s assertion that: It is he who broadcasted Imamiyyah jurisprudence, true sciences and correct religious creeds.^[71] We reply: The above statement entailed one of the two things: It either means that he innovated a knowledge that is not known by his predecessors or his predecessors have failed the obligation of disseminating knowledge. Does any sane person ever think that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) did not explain to his community true sciences and correct religious creeds a perfect explanation? And that his companions have learnt them from him and conveyed them to the Muslims? This will entail censure either on him or on them. Nay, Imam Ja’afar as-Sadiq is lied against more than any of his predecessors and thus the defect is from those who lied against him and not from him. That is why many types of lies have been ascribed to him such as the books; al-Battaqah, al-Jafr and al-Hatf and statements on astrology (soothsaying and fortune telling).

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON MUSA BIN JA'AFAR AL-KHAZIM

After Ja'afar as-Sadiq was Musa bin Ja'afar. Abu Hatim ar-Razi said concerning him: "Reliable, truthful, a leader among the leaders of Muslims."

I (Ibn Taimiyyah) said: Musa was born in Madina in the year 120AH and Caliph al-Mahdi invited him to Bagdad and then sent him back to Madina where he continued to live until the time of Caliph Harun al-Rashid. When Harun arrive at Madina after performing the lesser pilgrimage he went with him to Bagdad and imprisoned him there and he died in prison.

After the death of Musa knowledge is not taken from them and this is well known from their history and other sources of information, they also do not have in the science of exegesis of the Qur'an any known interpretation; but they have virtues and outstanding good works. Musa bin Ja'afar is well known as a pious person and a man of religious devotion.

The story that has been narrated from Shaqiq al-Balkhi is a lie for it contradicted the known state and conduct of Musa bin Ja'afar. With regard to what this Rafidi stated: "Bishr al-Hafy repented on his hands," We reply that: These are among the lies that are being transmitted by those who do not know the condition Musa and they do not know the condition of Bishr; when Musa bin Ja'afar arrived at Iraq (Bagdad), Harun Al-Rashid imprisoned him, so he is not among those who pass by the house of Bishr and his like among the masses.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON ALI BIN MUSA RIDA

The Rafidi stated: “And his son Ali Ridha is the most abstemious and austere among the people of his time and is more knowledgeable than all people of his time. Scholars and jurists of Ahlus Sunnah learned a lot from him and Caliph Ma’amun appointed him to some position of authority due to his piety and virtues. He once advised his brother Zaid saying: O Zaid! What will you say to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) if you spill blood, take people’s property unjustly, make roads unsafe and you are deceived by the foolish men of Kufa!? The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has said: Surely Fatima has protected her chastity and thus Allah has freed her offspring from Hell-Fire. In another hadith Ali said: The Messenger of Allah was asked: Why is she called Fatima? He replied: Because Allah has freed her offspring from Hell-fire. Thus, her chastity shall not be the reason for freeing her offspring from Fire if they commit injustice. By Allah they never attain that but through obedience to Allah and if you want to attain it through disobedience to Allah then you are more honored by Allah over them.

Caliph Ma’amun inscribed his name on minted money, he wrote to all parts of the Caliphate informing them that he is his successor and therefore, people shall give him vow of allegiance and he stopped wearing black clothes and started wearing green clothes.” The Rafidi added: Abu Nuwas made a poem for him wherein he stated: I cannot be able to praise an Imam, whose servant is Gabriel.”

We say in reply: Among the greatest calamities that befall the offspring of Husain (progeny of the Messenger of Allah from his lineage) is that they have been tried and tested through the attachment of Shia Rafidah to them, honoring them, extolling their virtues and praising them. Surely, they are praising them with that which is in reality contempt and disrespect to them. They made claims in their favors without evidence and they mention statements by which if their real virtues are not known from other them (Rafidah) then they have tarnished and dented their image for what they (Shia) are mentioning are censures and not praises.

Surely, Ali bin Musa Ridha has known virtues, good traits and outstanding praiseworthy works and praises that he deserved and are more appropriate to his status and state; these are known by men of knowledge, in contrast to this Rafidi who did not mention in his favor one virtue with evidence.

With regard to his words: “He is the most abstemious of his time and more knowledgeable than his contemporaries.” We reply that: This are only claims without evidence; whoever went to the extreme regarding a person can make such claims in his favor. Then how is it with you when people knew that during his time there are those who are more knowledgeable than him and those who are more abstemious and frugal than him such as Imam Shafi’i, Ishaq bin Rahwiyyah, Ahmad bin Hanbal, Ashhab bin Abduaziz, Abi Sulaiman al-Darimi and Ma’aruf al-Kurkhi etc.

With regard to his assertion that: “Jurists and scholars learned a lot from him.” We reply that: This is one of the most apparent clear lies for the grand jurists and scholars have never been his students, but if you say; there are scholars of lesser degree that learned from him, that cannot be countered because students of knowledge can learn from middle class scholars and scholars of lesser degree. What some people mentioned that Ma’aruf al-Kurkhi has been his servant, he is connected to him and that he embraced Islam in his hand are all lies by the consensus of those who have knowledge about this issue.

The hadith that he mentioned of the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning Fatima is a lie and a fabrication by the consensus of those who are versed in hadith sciences. Even those who are not scholars of hadith can uncover its falsity because the hadith stated: “Surely Fatima has protected her chastity and thus Allah has forbidden her offspring from the Hell-Fire.” This entailed that protecting her chastity is the cause of forbidding her children from the Fire and this is absolutely, false for Sarah (the wife of Prophet Abraham) has protected her chastity and Allah does not forbid all her offspring from entering Hell-Fire.

Again, calling Angel Gabriel (a.s), the Messenger of Allah to Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) as a servant of the Prophet (s.a.w) is a statement made by a person who does not know the status of Angels and their station of Allah sending them to Prophets. Mostly Shia Rafida's proofs are nothing but slogans that suited their ignorance and injustice, in addition to fabricated stories that suited their ignorance and lies. Principles of religion cannot be proven by these types of slogans (and myths) except by those who cannot be counted among men of knowledge and discernment.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT CONCERNING MUHAMMAD BIN ALI AL-JAWWAD

The Rafidi stated: "His son Muhammad bin Ali al-Jawwad was on the path of his father in knowledge, fear of Allah and generosity. When his father Ridha died Caliph Ma'amun was attracted to his love due to his vast knowledge, adherence to religion and sharp intelligence though he is a young man. When he desired to marry to him his daughter Ummul Fadl just as he married his other daughter to Imam Ridha. Banu Abbas hated and opposed the move fearing that the Caliphate will get out of their hands for he may request for vow of allegiance for him (as his successor) just as he has done so for his father. Those who are his closest relatives met him and advised him not to do so saying: He is young and ignorant. Caliph Ma'amu said: I knew him better than you, but if you like you can test him. They accepted the challenge and hired a Judge named Yahaya bin Akthum and paid him much money in order to debate al-Jawwad. On the appointed day people gathered together and became seated. The Judge asked al-Jawwad: What do you say concerning a pilgrim who killed an animal? Al-Jawwad replied: When did he kill it; while in Ihram^[72] or after Ihram? Is he a learned person or an ignorant man? He killed it intentionally or unintentionally? Is it a big animal or a small animal? Is the pilgrim a free man or a slave? Is he a grown up matured man or a child (who has not reach puberty)? Is the hunted animal a bird or otherwise? Judge Yahya bin Akthum was confused and disorganized and defeat was written on his face. People realized that he has been defeated and Caliph Ma'amun said to his relatives: You now know what you are denying. He then turned his face to al-Jawwad and asked him: Do you request for my daughter in marriage? He replied: Yes. He then told him: Request for her marriage to you. He requested and the request was accepted and he paid a dowry of Five Hundred Dirham which is similar to that of his grandmother Fatima; and thus she became his wife.

We reply saying: Muhammad bin Ali al-Jawwad is one of the prominent personalities among the Prophet's progeny and he is well-

known with generosity and liberality and that is why he is called al-Jawwad (the generous), he died a young man of twenty five years (95-120AH). Caliph Ma'amun married his daughter to him and he used to send to him every year one million Dirham. Caliph Ma'atasim invited him to Bagdad and he continued to live in it until he died.

The narrations that this Rafidi mentioned is just like similar stories that he has been mentioning about Imams. Surely, Shia Rafida do not have clear (uncontaminated) intellect, nor do they have sound texts, they neither establish a truth nor do they destroy a falsehood; neither with cogent proof and exposition nor with hands and weapons. Nothing of what he mentioned establish the virtues of Muhammad bin Ali al-Jawwad, let alone proving his Imamah? The story that he mentioned about Judge Yahya bin Akthum is nothing but fabricated lies, which makes nobody happy but the ignorant. Yahya Bin Akthum is a learned, virtuous jurist that cannot be confused by a person asking questions about a pilgrim who has killed an animal for even scholars of lesser status knew the rule concerning this type of issue; it is neither a complex issue nor a strange one, it is also not a specialized issue that only a knowledgeable, higher level scholar can answer.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT CONCERNING ALI BIN MUSA AL-HADI

The Rafidi stated: "His son Ali al-Hadi who is called al-Askari because Caliph Mutawakkil invited him from Madina to Bagdad and then from Bagdad to Samarra and he live in it in a place called Askar, then he moved to the main town of Samarra and stayed there for twenty years and nine months. Mutawakkil sent him to that town because he hated him (Ali bin Hadi) and he was informed about his status in Madina and the inclination of people towards him. Thus, he invited Yahya bin Hubairah and asked him to bring him. This distressed the people of Madina for they fear for his life because he has been good to them, and devoted to worship always in the mosque. But Yahya swore that there is nothing to fear with regard to his life. He searched his house and found nothing other than copies of the Qur'an, supplications, and books of knowledge and he becomes honored in his estimation and he started to serve him by himself. When he reached Bagdad he went with him to meet the governor of Bagdad, Ishaq bin Ibrahim at-Ta'i, who said to him: "O Yahya this man was born by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and Caliph Mutawakkil is well known to you; so if you incited him against al-Hadi he will kill him and then the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) will complain against you on the Day of Judgment, before Allah." Yahya said: "I swear by Allah I will not speak about him but with good." Yahya said: "When we entered before Caliph Mutawakkil I informed him about his good conduct, his fear of Allah and his austerity." This made Mutawakkil to honor him. Thereafter, Mutawakkil became ill and he promised to give out a lot of money in charity if he became well, he asked scholars about that and did not get any reply so he sent for al-Hadi and asked him with what amount he can fulfill his oath. Al-Hadi asked him to give in charity Eighty Three Dirham. Mutawakkil asked him the reason and he replied: because Allah the Most High said: **'Truly Allah has given you victory on many battle fields...' (9:25).**"

We say in reply: This statement is like the ones that preceded it for he did not mention a virtue with sound proof, nay he mentioned what scholars knew is false. He mentioned in the story that the governor of Bagdad was at that time is Ishaq bin Ibrahim at-Ta'i and this is of his ignorance because the governor at that time is Ishaq bin Ibrahim al-Khuza'i. He is a well known person and his family is prominent – they are from the Khuza'ah tribe. His full name is Ishaq bin Ibrahim bin Husain bin Mus'ab and his cousin Abdullah bin Tahir bin Husain bin Mus'ab is the well known governor of Khorasan and his history is well known. His son Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Tahir was the governor of Bagdad during the reign of Mutawakkil and others and he is the one who led the prayer for the dead of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal when he died. This Ishaq bin Ibrahim the governor of Bagdad during the reign of Mu'atasim and Wathiq and some days during the reign of Mutawakkil; all of those people are from Khuza'ah tribe and not from Tay' tribe; they belong to a prominent family.

With regard to religious verdict which this Rafidi cited when Mutawakkil become sick, he made a vow to give many (large) amount of money in charity and he asked jurists concerning the total amount of “many,” but they could not give him any answer and that Ali bin Muhammad al-Jawwad asked him to give out Eighty Three Dirham, because Allah has said: **“Truly Allah has given you victory on many battle fields...” (9:25)**, and that the many battle fields mentioned in the verse are a total of twenty seven battles led by the Messenger of Allah and fifty six detachments that he fielded under the leadership of one of his companions. This type of story has been narrated by some people ascribing it to Musa Ridha with Caliph Ma'amun. The fact about this story is between two options: It is either a fabricated lies or it showed that the person who gave that verdict is an ignorant person.

Surely if somebody said: Upon me is many Dirham or I swear by Allah I will give so and so many Dirham or I will surely give out many Dirham as charity that does not mean Eighty Three Dirham in the estimation of any Muslim scholar. The above assertion is false from many angles:

Firstly, the statement of someone that the places or fields on which the Prophet (s.a.w) participated personally in its battle are twenty seven and the situations where he sent detachments are fifty six is not true for the Prophet (s.a.w) did not led a total of twenty seven battles by the consensus of scholars of history, nay it is far less than that.

Secondly, this verse was revealed after the battle of Hunain and Allah the Most High is informing the believers in it about what has happened in the past (before the battle of Hunain). Therefore, it is imperative to consider what has happened before that as the “many.” After the battle of Hunain there occurred the battle of Ta’if and the battle of Tabuk and most of the detachments were dispatched after the battle of Hunain, such as the detachments that were dispatched after the conquest of Makka, like sending Jarir bin Abdullah to Dhil Khilsah etc. and this Jarir embraced Islam before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) by one year. Now, if many of the battles and detachments have occurred after the revelation of this verse, then it is impossible that a verse that is giving information about the past is talking about all battles and detachments that occurred during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w).

Thirdly, surely Allah the Most High did not gave them victory in all these battles, nay in the battle of Uhud they fled and that was a day of trial and differentiation, so also in the battle of Mua’atah and some detachments also faced loss; so they were not victorious in all battles. So, if the total of all battles and detachments are Eighty Three; they have not been victorious in all of them so that the sum total of their victories could be said to be Eighty Three.

Fourthly, even if we assume that what is meant in the verse is eighty three then that does not entailed confining this measure to the word “many,” for it is a general expression that encompasses thousand, two thousand and thousands. Therefore, it encompasses many types of measures and thus confining it to one measure to the exclusion of others is an arbitrary action.

Fifthly, Allah the Most High said: **“...Who is he that will lend to Allah a goodly loan so that He may multiply it to him many times? And it is Allah that decreases or increases (your provisions), and unto Him you shall return” (2:245)**, therefore, Allah the Most High increases a good work seven hundred times by text of the Qur’an, it also come in other places that he increases it to two million good works; all these have been called “many” and those are many places. Allah the Most high said: **“... How often a small group overcame many hosts by Allah's Leave?” And Allah is with the patient ones, etc. (2:249)**, “Many’ here has taken many types of measure because a known group that is “many” has not been confined to a particular number; the small group can be one thousand while the “many” group can be three thousand; thus one thousand is small in comparison to “many” number of the other group.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT CONCERNING MUHAMMAD BIN HASSAN THE AWAITED

The Rafidi stated: “And his son is our master Muhammad, the Mahdi. Ibn Jawzi reported from Ibn Umar who said the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘At the end of time a man from my lineage will appear, his name is like my name and his agnomen is like my agnomen, he will fill the earth with justice as it was filled with injustice; he is the Mahdi.’”

We reply thus: Surely Muhammad bin Jarir at-Tabari and Abdulbaqi bin Qani and other scholars of genealogy and history have stated that Hasan bin Ali al-Askari did not beget a child and Shia Imamiyyah that are claiming that he has a child are claiming that the child has entered an underground cellar in Samarra as a child (or a baby). Some of them say at that time he is two years old, some say three years and yet others say five years. If this type of person truly exist and is known then it will be compulsory – by the decree of the Qur’an, the Sunnah and the consensus of scholars – to take care of him and nurse him by a person that can take care of his body such as his mother or his grandmother and those who are similar to them, that can nurse him and that his property will be taken care of by a caretaker; such as someone who his late father appointed by will – if there is any – or someone among his relatives – if there is no will – or a representative of the ruler, for he is an orphan by the death of his father.

Allah the Most High said: **“And try orphans (as regards their intelligence) until they reach the age of marriage; if then you find sound judgment in them, release their property to them...” (4:6).** Thus you cannot hand over the property of this type of person to him until he reached the age of marriage and found to reach maturity of the mind as Allah has mentioned in His Book. Thus, how can a person who deserved to be protected in his person and property be an infallible leader (Imam) for all Muslims and nobody can be a believer until he believes in him?

Again, this man (Mahdi) by their (Shia) consensus – whether he is assumed to exist or he does not exist – they are not getting any benefit from him, neither in their religion nor in their worldly affairs. He never taught anybody anything and he is never known with any characteristics whether good or bad and thus, nothing has been attained with him of the aims of leadership or its benefits, neither specifically nor generally. Nay, if we assume that he exist, then he is absolutely harmful to the people of the earth without any benefit. Surely, those who believe in him did not get any benefit from him; they did not get through him any grace or benefit and according to them whoever disbelieve in him will be punished in the Hereafter. Therefore, he is an absolute evil without any benefit and the creation of this type of man is not of the acts of the Wise and the Just.

They (Shia Rafidah) said: He is hidden from people due to their injustice!

We reply: firstly, injustice exists at the time of his parents and they were not hidden.

Secondly, those who believed in him have filled many parts of the earth, then why did not he meet with them sometimes or send to them a Messenger who will teach them some sciences and instruct them in religion.

Thirdly, it is possible for him to reside in one of the many places where those who believe in him reside, such as the mountains of Syria where there are strong Shia enclaves.

Fourthly, if he cannot be able to teach anybody any science or religious knowledge due to this fear (of being killed), then his existence is neither grace nor benefit. And this has contradicted their creed, and this is in contrast to a Prophet that was sent and he was denied by his people for he has delivered the Message and those who believed in him have attained grace and benefits of the blessings of Allah upon them. But this, the awaited Mahdi; nothing of grace or benefit has been attained through him other waiting for the one that will never come, (being in) continuous regret, remorse and

pain, erecting enmity against all people and making supplications that Allah will not grant. This is why they are calling upon him to come out and appear for more than Four Hundred and Fifty years ago (now over One Thousand and two Hundred years ago) and nothing has happened with regard to that.

Again, for a person among Muslims, in the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) to live all these periods is something which falsity is known by the prevailing custom for nobody is known to be born a Muslim and live for one hundred and twenty years, let alone all these periods! It has come in a sound hadith that the Messenger of Allah said: ***“Have you seen this night of yours? At the end of one hundred years after this (night) none would survive on the surface of the earth (from among my Companions)” (Bukhari and Muslim).*** Thus, whoever is a child of one year among those who are living at that time will absolutely not live for more than one hundred years. Thus, if the lifespan at that time cannot pass this limit, then the periods that come after that more deserved to have similar lifespan as the general prevailing custom. Surely, the lifespan of human beings became less by the passage of time, for Prophet Noah (a.s) lived among his people for nine hundred and fifty years (950) and Prophet Adam (a.s) lived for one thousand years as related in sound hadith that has been recorded by Ibn Majah. Lifespan at that time is long and the lifespan of this community is between sixty and seventy and very few among them pass this measure and this too has been established by sound hadiths.

Their argument with the life of Khidr is a false argumentation upon a false assumption. Who will confirm to them the existence of Khidr? What has been affirmed by investigative scholars is that he is dead and even if he exists he does not belong to this community. That is why there are many liars among Jinn and men who are claiming that they are Khidr and those who see such a person will assume that he is Khidr; there are many true stories with regard to that which we knew and which will fill much space if discussed in details. So, also with regard to the awaited Shia Mahdi; a number of people are – each of them – claiming to be the Mahdi; among them there are

those who appeared to groups of people, others hid that and mention it to only one or two people; the deceits of each of those people are uncovered as the deceptions of those who claimed to be Khidr are always uncovered.

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE ATTESTATION OF THE RAFIDI WITH HADITH OF MAHDI

Concerning his (the Rafidi) statement: "Ibn Jauzi recorded on the authority of Ibn Umar who said the Prophet (s.a.w) said: There will appear at the end of time a man from my descendants, his name is like my name and his agnomen is like my agnomen. He will fill earth with justice as it was filled with injustice; that is the Mahdi."

We reply to the above from many angles thus:

Firstly, you (Shia) do not attest with hadith of Ahlus Sunnah, thus this type of hadith does not benefit you in anything. And if you say it is an evidence for Ahlus Sunnah, we will explain to you what they said about it.

Secondly, this hadith is alone or single hadith (hadith Ahad), then how can we establish with it a principle of religion by which belief is not sound except with it?

Thirdly, the expression in the (sound) hadith is against you and not in your favor, for the true expression of the hadith is: ***"His name will be like my name and the name of his father will be like that of my father."*** Thus, the Mahdi that has been foretold by the Prophet (s.a.w) is Muhammad bin Abdullah and not Muhammad bin Hasan al-Askari. It has been narrated on the authority of Ali (r.a) that he said: "He is from the descendants of Hasan bin Ali," and not from the descendants of Husain bin Ali (as believed by the Shia).^[73] The known hadiths of Mahdi have been recorded by Ahmad, Abu Dawud and Tirmidhi etc. like the hadith of Abdullah bin Mas'ud who said: ***"The Prophet (s.a.w) said: If only one day of this world remained. Allah would lengthen that day, till He raised up in it a man from my descendants whose name is like my name and his father's name is the same as my father's, who will fill the earth with equity and justice as it has been filled with oppression and tyranny" (Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi, Ahmad).***

Fourthly, the hadith that the Rafidi mentioned is: "His name is like my name and his agnomen is like my agnomen." This hadith did not say: ***"...whose name is like my name and his father's name is the same as my father's..."*** and nobody among the scholar of hadiths, in the books of hadiths recorded it with that expression or wordings. Thus the Rafidi did not mention that hadith with its known expression in the books of hadith (of Ahlus Sunnah) such as Musnad of Ahmad, Sunan of Tirmidhi and Sunan of Abu Dawud etc., he just mentioned it with a fabricated expression (as is their custom and tradition) which none of them has recorded.

The Rafidi stated: "Ibn Jawzi recorded it with its chain of authority;" if he meant by that the prominent scholar who has written many books, and who is called Abu Faraj, then this is a lie against him. And if he means by that his grandson Yusuf bin Quz Augali, the author of the history book titled "Mir'at az-Zaman" and the author of a book on Ithna Ashar (Imams) titled "Ilam al-Khawwas," then this man write in his books both good and garbage and he used to attest on issues with many hadiths that are weak and fabricated. He use to write for each sect according to its belief; he write for Shia what they want so that he can get payment from them and he wrote on the school of jurisprudence of Abu Hanifa for some rulers and kings so that he can get some worldly benefits from them. His methodology is that of a preacher who was asked: "What is your school of thought?" He replied: "In which town?" That is why you find in some of his books censure for the right guided Caliphs and the Prophet's companions for the sake of compromise with those who want such type of books among the Shia and in his other works you find him honoring the right guided Caliphs and the companions of the Prophet (r.a).

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE POSITION OF IMAMS IN OBEDIENCE AND DISOBEDIENCE

The Rafidi stated: “Those are the honored, virtuous, infallible Imams, they reached the highest state of perfection and excellence and they did not engrossed themselves with what other leaders (Imams) engrossed themselves of being busy with worldly authority, profligacy, wine drinking and other forms of evil pastimes to the extent that some of them did corruption with relatives as is well known among people. Shia Imamiyyah said: Allah will judge between us and those people and He is the best of judges.”

He (the Rafidi) said: What is better than what a poet stated:

If you wish to choose a school of thought Knows you not men
that conveyed the knowledge
Shun statements of Shafi'i and Malik And Ahmad reporting
from Ka'ab Ahbar
Befriend a people whose words and statement Our grandfather
from Gabriel from The Lord

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly, we say: With regard to the infallibility of Imams, you just made a claim, which you did not substantiate with any evidence. You just claimed that: “It is incumbent upon Allah to appoint an infallible Imam for the people (after the Prophet) so that he can be a grace and benefit on what has been made obligatory upon them.” We have explained the falsity of this premise from many angles, the least of which is this is something that is missing and nonexistent. There is not any infallible Imam with whom people attain grace or any benefit. If there is no proof to negate that claim other than the fact that everybody who has clear untainted intellect knew that nobody is attaining any benefit from the awaited Mahdi either in religion or in worldly affairs that suffices. Then what can you say with many more evidences on the falsity of that issue ad claim?

Secondly: The Rafidi stated: “Each of those (Imams) have reached extreme perfection.” We reply that: This is just a claim without

evidence and an expression without knowledge which can be countered by anybody with similar claims. If a claimant claimed perfection to the more prominent men of knowledge over and above the Askariyain (tenth and eleventh Shia Imams) and those similar to them – from among the companions, the Tabi'un and all the Muslims Imams (scholars) – that would have been more deservedly accepted. Whoever studied the history of these men he will know their virtues in religion and knowledge which has come to us in concurrent manner more than what has been mentioned with regard to the Askariyain and those similar to them of lies and shunning the truth.

Thirdly, with regard to his words: "Those...Imams." If he meant by that they have been leaders with power and authority and they command the armies! Then that is a clear lie and they (Shia) are not making such claims, in the contrast they are saying that: (those Imams) were weak, deterred, prevented, defeated, subjugated and oppressed by unjust oppressors. None of them was able to attain power and authority except Imam Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a), even though some matters became difficult for him for half of the Muslim community – or less or above – refused to give him vow of allegiance, many of them fought him and he fought them, many of them did not fight him and they did not fight on his side and among them there are those who are better than those who fought him or those who fought on his side; among them are virtuous Muslim who were not on the side of Ali. Nay, those who refused to fight with him or against him are better than those who fight against him or fight on his side.

If the Rafidi means that those Imams have knowledge and religion by which they deserved to be the rulers! Then even if this claim is sound it does not make them rulers whose obedience is necessary upon people. Consider these instances: If a person deserved to be leader (Imam) of prayer in a mosque that does not make him the Imam, or if he deserved to be a judge that does not make him a judge and his being the most deserving to be a commander of army does not make him commander of the army. Prayer is not sound but

behind the actual Imam, judging between people can only be carried out by a person with the power to do so and not by the one who deserved to be a judge and the army can only fight under the commander appointed over them and not under the one who deserved to be appointed as their commander.

Summarily, action is based on power, authority and ability and whoever does not have control over power and authority can never be a leader even if he deserved to be supported so that he became the leader. His being by law, he deserved to be invested with authority, or it is obligatory that he is conferred with authority is not the same as being given authority. The Imam (ruler, leader or Caliph) is the one who is firmly established, invested with power and able to exercise authority and none of those attained that except Imam Ali (r.a), as explained already.

Fourthly, we ask you: What do you mean by more deserved? Do you mean that one of those by obligation shall be appointed the Imam to the exclusion of the rest of the Quraish? Or do you mean that one of those is suitable for the Caliphate? If you mean the former, then that is refused and rejected, and if you mean the latter, then that is a shared trait between them and many men among the Quraish.

Fifthly: To say: The Imam is the one who is taken as an example, imitated, and followed. This can be attained by two means: firstly, he is referred to in knowledge and religion and he is followed by the choice of the person who obeyed him, because he has the knowledge of what Allah has commanded and he is commanding accordingly. Thus, he is obeyed in obedience to Allah although he is unable to compel people to obey him. Secondly, that he command power, authority and armies and thus he is obeyed willingly or unwillingly because he can be able to enforce obedience upon his subjects. Allah the Most High said: **“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and**

more suitable for final determination” (4:59). The phrase: “... **those of you who are in authority...**” has been interpreted as those with power like commanders of armies and it has been interpreted as those with knowledge and religion; both interpretations are sound. Those two descriptions have been perfect with regard to the rightly guided Caliphs for they have been perfect in knowledge, religion, and justice, so also in politics, power and authority.

Sixthly: The Rafidi stated: “They didn’t take their leaders (Imams) those that others took and who busied themselves with authority and disobedience (to Allah).”

We reply: This is a false statement. If he means that Ahlus Sunnah are following those rulers in whatever they commit of disobedience to Allah, then he is lying against them. Surely, Ahlus Sunnah scholars have agreed upon that nobody can be followed in disobedience to Allah and such a person cannot be taken as an example.

If he means that Ahlus Sunnah are seeking aid of those rulers in whatever is required in obedience to Allah and they are supporting them in whatever they do of obedience to Allah. We say that if taking them as leaders under these considerations are not allowed, then Shia Rafida have erred more in that than Ahlus Sunnah. This is because they always seek the help of unbelievers and oppressors in their pursuits and they aid, and support unbelievers and oppressors in much of their demands; and these conducts and practices of the Shia are seen and witnessed in all periods and places. Take for example this Rafidi and his brothers; they took Mongols (hordes who attacked Islam and Muslims), unbelievers, profligates and ignorant men as leaders (and then claimed that they are on right guidance).

Seventhly: Those Imams that he mentioned in his book and claimed that they are infallible never possess power and authority by which the goal of leadership can be attained and we know that of those goals is to attain necessary aid in obedience to Allah. If they do not possess power and authority we cannot pray behind them Friday prayers and regular congregational prayers, they are neither leaders

in Jihad nor in pilgrimage, boundaries cannot be protected with them, they cannot settle disputes, man cannot be able to claim back his rights that have been taken away by other nor get his rights from the state treasury and roads and highways are not secured by them. All these things requires a man with power, ability and authority to carry them out and one cannot be able to shoulder them except if he has helpers to aid him in discharging them; these responsibilities have been carried out by other than those Imams. Thus, whoever expected an incapable leader to discharge these responsibilities is an ignorant, unjust person and whoever sought them from the one who is capable of discharging them is a man of knowledge, guided and right; the latter will attain his religious and worldly benefits while the former will lose his religious and worldly benefits.

Eighthly: His claim that all the Caliphs are engrossed in what he mentioned of wine drinking and many forms of profligacy is a lie against them and there are a lot of fabricated lies in most of the narrated stories in relation to that issue. We knew among them there are just, abstemious, self-denying rulers such as Umar bin Abdulaziz and Mahdi Billah. Most of the Caliphs of Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas did not display such corrupt acts although one of them might be tried with committing some sins; he might have repented from them, he might have many good works that erases those sins and he might be tried with some calamities by which Allah forgive those sins.

Summarily, the good works of rulers are great and their sins are great. One of those rulers, even if committed sins and disobedience to Allah which individuals among the believers do not commit; he might also have good works which individual Muslims do not perform, such as commanding what is good and forbidding what is evil, protecting the frontiers, fighting the enemies, discharging a lot of rights to those who deserved them, preventing a lot of injustice and upholding a lot of justice.

We are not saying that they are free from committing injustice and sins and we are not saying that most of the Muslims are free from

committing sins. What we are saying is that: Existence of sins and injustice among some leaders do not prevent us from cooperating with them in whatever they do in obedience to Allah. Ahlus Sunnah does not command obeying leaders except in obedience to Allah and not in disobedience to Him. There is no harm on whoever agrees with someone in obedience to Allah if he did not associate himself with what he commits of disobedience. It is like a man who performs pilgrimage with other pilgrims who have committed some sins, for the sins of those people cannot harm him. Likewise, if he pray Friday prayer and congregational prayers with people, attend religious studies circles and fought with them in Jihad; he will not be harmed because some of those who he associated in those acts have committed some sins. Leaders are like all other people; they are associated with in whatever they do of obedience to Allah and they will be shunned in whatever they do of disobedience to Allah. This has been the conduct of Ahlul Bayt (family and descendants of the Prophet) and whoever follows them in that he has taken their good example.^[74] This is in contrast to the one who absolved himself from the first to embrace Islam and the generality of men of knowledge and religion and aided their enmities unbelievers and hypocrites, as practiced by Shia Rafidah, the misguided (folks).

If a claimant claimed that those Imams have stored knowledge which other people do not have and which they have been hiding. Then, what is the benefit that people got from their hidden knowledge? Knowledge that is not taught is like treasure that is not spent. How can people follow and obey an Imam that is not teaching them the hidden knowledge? This is just like none existing Imam (Mahdi); no benefit is attained from both of them, neither felicity is attained nor grace.

If it is said, nay they have been explaining their hidden knowledge to their special close companions to the exclusion of those (scholars of Ahlus Sunnah). We reply that: Firstly, this is a lie against them for the like of Ja'afar as-Sadiq hasn't got a replacement (A scholar among the scholars of Prophet's progeny who surpassed him) and those Imams Of the Ahlus Sunnah have taken knowledge from him, such

as Imam Malik, Ibn ‘Uyainah, Shu’ubah, ath-Thauri, Ibn Juzaij, Yahya bin Sa’id and other grand, prominent scholars. Again, whoever thinks that those honored scholars are hiding their knowledge from the like of those grand scholars and they are exclusively and specifically teaching and imparting it to unknown people, who possess neither word of truth nor good mention in the Muslim community; such a person is really thinking evil about them. Surely, those scholars of the Prophet’s family are truthful and sincere with regard to their love of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), their obedience to Him, their protection of His religion, their conveyance of His religion, their love for whoever loves Allah and their hatred for whoever is an enemy to Him and their securing the religion of Islam from reduction or increase. These are traits and good works that are not found – even something close to that – with any Shia scholar and this is a fact known out of necessity by those who knew those Imams and is conversant with those Shia scholars.

Consider this as a general rule: That you will find at all periods that Shia scholars, just like this author; he is the best Shia Imamiyyah scholar of his time, nay some Shia are saying; there isn’t any scholar in the East who is better than him in general sciences, despite that his statements are showing that he is the most ignorant of all Allah’s creations with the circumstances of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); his words and actions. Thus, he relates fabricated lies which falsities are very clear from many approaches. If he knew that he is telling lies, then there is a sound hadith in which the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Whoever narrated a hadith on my authority and he knew that it is a lie, he is surely one of the liars.”*** And if he is ignorant then he is the most ignorant of all men about the state of affairs of the Prophet (s.a.w). It is said by a poet:

If you don’t know that is a calamity
calamity is greater

And if you know the

*** With regard to the poems that he made it has been countered by the like of it:

If thou wish to choose a school of thought	To get closer to Allah
and escape from Fire	
Believe the Book of Allah and Sunnah that	Arrived from His Prophet
and conveyed by the best	
Shun Rafidites and innovations that will	Take its harbingers to
Fire and disgrace	
Move behind Prophet's companions for	They are the stars of
guidance guiding who follows	
Abandon the path of Rafd for it is based	On unbelief, on brink of
precipice crumbling down	
Two paths either guidance and happiness	Or damnation with
misguided unbelievers	
Which of the two ways rated His protection	And more guided when
the Lord Judges	
Is it of the one who curses the companions	And then rejected the
most soundest texts	
Or the one who hold revealed texts and companions path	While
loving virtuous descendants	

*** Ninthly: We say: An able Imam with authority, who regulate people's affairs in most of their interests and needs; secure the highways, execute legal punishments, prevent injustice, fight the enemies of Allah and Islam and discharge rights to those who deserved them, is better than unreal, nonexistent Imam.

Shia Rafidah are inviting to infallible Imam; they do not have in their hearts anything more than nonexistent Imam and in reality they have unbelievers or unjust oppressors as their Imams. With regard to Ahlus Sunnah – even if we assume that they have some injustice and sins – they are better than the real leaders upon who Rafidah are relying on and they are better than unreal nonexistent Imam. With regard to rest of the Imams (all scholars of the Prophet's household) who existed, Ahlus Sunnah take them as examples, the way they considered other scholars as their Imams and scholars, and the person who take them as examples in addition to other scholars is better than the one who take them exclusively as examples, because knowledge is narrations and understanding and

whatever the scholars agreed on and believed is stronger and more deserved to be followed. There is nothing good with Shia but Ahlus Sunnah are associated with it and the goodness that Ahlus sunnah exclusively possessed Shia are not associated with it.

*** Tenthly: The Rafidi stated: Shia Imamiyyah said; Allah will surely judge between us and those people for He is the best of Judges.”

We reply to Imamiyyah: Surely Allah has judged between them and you in this world with what He showed of signs and clear proof and the victories He is giving to people of truth over you. They are always victorious over you with clear proofs and explanations and with strength and tongue, the way He made the religion of His Prophet (s.a.w) to excel over all religions. Allah the Most High said: **“It is He Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad) with guidance and the religion of truth (Islam), to make it superior over all religions even though the Mushrikun (polytheists, pagans, idolaters, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah) hate (it)” (9:33).** And He said: **“It is He Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad) with guidance and the religion of truth (Islam), to make it superior over all religions even though the Mushrikun (polytheists, pagans, idolaters, disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah) hate (it)” (48:28).** He again said: **“He it is Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad) with guidance and the religion of truth (Islamic Monotheism) to make it victorious over all (other) religions even though the Mushrikun (polytheists, pagans, idolaters, and disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah and in His Messenger Muhammad) hate (it)” (61:9).** Therefore, those whose belief is the belief of Ahlus Sunnah which you have contradicted are always victorious over you with proofs and explanations, like the victory of the religion of Muhammad (s.a.w) over all religions. The religion of Muhammad (s.a.w) never became victorious over all religions except with Ahlus Sunnah, like the way Islam become victorious during the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman (r.a); in a way that it has never happened to any other religion. Imam Ali (r.a) – although he is among the rightly guided Caliphs and one of the chief of the first to embrace Islam – Islam was not victorious during his Caliphate, nay

tribulation (civil war) occurred between the Muslims and their enemies among the unbelievers, the Christians and the Magians in Syria and the East covet harming them and overpowering them. After Imam Ali there are neither men of religion and knowledge nor men with might and power that Allah aided Islam with them except Ahlus Sunnah. With regard to Shia Rafida, they either associate with enemies of Islam (aid them against Islam and Muslims) or shunned any of the two groups (Muslims or unbelievers). Undoubtedly, Allah the Most High will judge on the Day of Judgment between the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar and those who hold enmity against them among the past and the present generations in the like manner He will judge between Muslims and unbelievers.

*** Eleventh: We ask: Against who are these complaints of committing oppression directed? If you reply: Against those who oppressed Ali (r.a) such as Abubakar and Umar (r.a) – in accordance to your claims. Then we say to you: The opponent or complainant in that case is Imam Ali (r.a) and he is dead, likewise Abubakar and Umar (r.a) are also dead and this case neither concern you nor does it concern us, except on the way of explaining the truth and aiding those who possess it; and we have explained with clear proofs that Abubakar and Umar (r.a) more deserved to be just and maintain justice than anybody else in the Islamic community and the farthest away from committing injustice than anyone else. Imam Ali (r.a) never thinks that he is leader of the Islamic community despite them and this point will be explained in its right place – Allah willing.

If you say: We are complaining about the injustice of the rulers that prevented those Imams of their rights of being leaders. We reply saying: This is a branch of our claim that those twelve men have been seeking for leadership or they used to believe that they are the infallible leaders of the Islamic community. And these are lies against them. Whether your claims are true or false Allah will judge between the two parties in that which they have disagreed. Allah said: **“Say: ‘O Allah! Creator of the heavens and the earth! All-Knower of the unseen and the seen. You will judge between your slaves about that wherein they used to differ’” (39:46).** If the complaint

of injustice is between some rulers and those men; whether it is disagreement over leadership or some wealth; undoubtedly, Allah will judge between all of them as He will judge between all contenders (on all issues).

*** Twelfth: We say: This poem that he attested with and considered it as a good statement are words of an ignorant person because all Ahlus Sunnah have agreed on what their grandfather conveyed from Allah through Angel Gabriel (a.s), nay they accepted the words of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and they believed in it. They do not ask him: From where did you learn this? This is because they knew that he is infallible and: **“Nor does he speak of (his own) desire. It is only an Inspiration that is inspired” (53:3-4).** They are called Ahlus Sunnah because they follow his Sunnah.

With regard to knowing what their grandfather conveyed and taught; then know that they seek for it from reliable, truth worthy and trustworthy men. So, if there is such knowledge with the Prophet's descendants and progeny they benefit from them and if such knowledge is found with other people, they benefit from them also. But just because their grandfather conveyed (religious knowledge) from Allah through Angel Gabriel (a.s) and they do not possess such knowledge; what can one do with them? People did not accept the teachings of Imams Malik, Shafi'i, Ahmad etc., but because they ascribed their words and statements to what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has brought. And surely, those scholars are among the knowledgeable men with what he brought, among the most ardent followers of his teachings and the most seekers of his teachings and acting upon it. If that is not the case, what goal do people want to achieve by honoring them? All the Sunnah that have been narrated by those people (scholars of the Prophet's family) are being narrated by other scholars like them and also all the answers they gave to religious questions and inquiries are given by scholars like them and Ahlus Sunnah do not consider the words of anybody among them as infallible and that they must be followed. Nay, if they differ in any matter they refer it back to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w).

Consider this as a general rule with those you come across in your period of the scholars of Qur'an, hadith and jurisprudence; you will find that most of those who call themselves Banu Hashim do not memorize the Qur'an and they do not know hadith but little and they do not know there interpretations. So if this type of Hashemite said: "Our grandfather received revelation through Angel Gabriel (a.s) from Allah." We reply to him saying: "Yes, but those people (Malik, Shafi'i, Ahmad etc.), are more learned than you in what your grandfather received through Angel Gabriel (a.s) from Allah. Do people take knowledge from those who know what their grandfather has brought from Allah or from those who does not know?" In a hadith, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"The learned are the heirs of the Prophets, and the Prophets leave neither dinar nor dirham, leaving only knowledge, and he who takes it takes an abundant portion"*** (Abu Dawud).

If he said: "What we meant are those twelve Imams." He is replied: What has been narrated by Ali bin Husain and Abu Ja'afar and their like of the Sunnah of their grandfather are accepted from them as is accepted from other scholars like them.^[75] If to say that people did not find more knowledge with Imam Malik, Shafi'i, and Ahmad etc., over what is found with Musa bin Ja'afar, Ali bin Musa and Muhammad bin Ali they would not have left these people for those people. And if this is not the case what aim or goal does students of knowledge have in leaving Musa bin Ja'afar and learning from Imam Malik bin Anas while both of them live in the same town and in the same period. If they find with Musa bin Ja'afar knowledge of the Prophet (s.a.w) that they found with Malik bin Anas they will have taken it from him due to the ardent desire of the Muslims to learn knowledge of the Prophet (s.a.w). The same Banu Hashim used to benefit and learn knowledge of the Prophet (s.a.w) from Imam Malik more than what they benefitted from their cousin Musa bin Ja'afar.

Imam Shafi'i come after Imam Malik and if to say he has found from Bani Hashim more than what he found in Malik of knowledge he would not have left them for him (preferred him over them). Imam Shafi'i used to confess that he never came across men more

knowledgeable than Imam Malik and Sufyan bin 'Uyainah, and his books are filled with quotations from those two scholars, but there is nothing in them from Musa bin Ja'afar and his like among Bani Hashim; by these we knew that his requirement of knowledge of the Prophet (s.a.w) is found with Imam Malik more than with those people.

We knew the perfect love of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal to the Prophet (s.a.w) and his Sunnah, his great desire to learn and love to know the words of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his actions, his love for whoever follows the Sunnah and his hatred against whoever contradicted it, his love for Bani Hashim and his writings about the virtues of Imam Ali, Hasan and Husain in the same way as he wrote about the virtues of the companions. Despite all these his books are filled with quotations from scholars such as Malik, ath-Thauri, Laith bin Sa'ad etc., without mentioning anything from Musa bin Ja'afar, Ali bin Musa and Muhammad bin Ali etc., if to say he found what he is seeking of knowledge from them he would have passionately acquired it from them.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ACCUSED AHLUS SUNNAH OF BEING RAWAFID IN SECRET

The Rafidi stated: "I do not think that anybody among the scholars studied these schools of thoughts (Madhabs) and choose other than Shia Imamiyyah in secret although in the open he is following other than it, in order to attain some worldly benefits. Schools and seminaries were built for them and endowments were placed under their control, so that the claims of Bani Abbas on the Caliphate will be perpetuated and the masses will be made to believe in the soundness of their Caliphate."

We reply that: This statement cannot be made except by the most ignorant person on the condition of Ahlus Sunnah and their reality or by one of the biggest liars and obstinate individual. Its falsity is very clear from many perspectives:

Surely it is well known that Ahlus Sunnah have been stronger, more vibrant and more established before schools are built; schools were built in Bagdad only during the fifth century of the Hijrah; the Nizzamiyyah was built around 460AH and they were built upon one school of thought (Hanafiyyah) out of four. The four schools of thoughts filled the East and the West although they do not have regular schools; in North Africa, they do not have a man from Bani Abbas as their ruler.

Again, Sunnah has been existence before the advent of the Abbasid Caliphate and it is stronger before then; Sunnah was stronger in the Caliphate of Bani Umayyah. This is because the Abbasids Caliphs employed in their regime many Shia Rafidah adherents and innovators. It shall be noted that Ahlus Sunnah have consensus that the Caliphate is not confined to Bani Abbas and that anyone else from among the Bani Hashim, or Bani Umayyah or any other clan of the Quraish tribe can be the Caliph. It is also well known that Ahlus Sunnah scholars such as Imam Malik and Ahmad etc. are the farthest men from compromising with rulers or seek to be close to

them and Ahlus Sunnah are honoring the rightly guided Caliphs and none of them is from the Abbasid family.

It is well known by all men of intellect that there is nobody among the prominent Muslim scholars who is a Rafidi; nay they have agreed upon the reality that Shia Rafidah are the most ignorant of all people and that they are astray and misguided. Their books give testimony to this fact, and here are books of all their schools of thoughts giving evidence to that reality. They do this although nobody is forcing them to mention Shia Rafidah and to explain their ignorance and misguidance. They always mention the ignorance and misguidance of Shia Rafidah, which showed necessarily they believed that Rafidah are the most ignorant and misguided people and the farthest away sect from the straight path and guidance. Why not, while the school of thought of those people contained the greatest reprehensible innovations for they are Jahmiyyah, Qadriyyah and Rafidah. Only Allah can be able to enumerate the statements of our predecessors and scholars on censure to each of those sects and their books are filled with that, such as the books of hadiths, Sunnah, jurisprudence, exegesis of the Qur'an, principles of religion and branches of religion etcetera. Those three sects are the most evil of all sects of the innovators, in addition to Murji'ah and Haruriyyah. [\[76\]](#)

Allah knew that with all my intense search and extensive study in order to know what people say, believe and their schools of thoughts, I never come across anybody who has good, honorable mention in this community who is being accused of believing in the creed of Shia Imamiyyah, not to speak of he believed in it in his heart. Hasan bin Saleh bin Hayy has been accused of belonging to Zaidiyyah, and he was a jurist, upright man, an ascetic. It was said that accusation is a lie against him and nobody has quoted him disparaging Abubakar and Umar (r.a) or rejecting the validity of their Caliphates. A group of the first Shia were accused of giving precedence to Ali (r.a) over Uthman (r.a), but nobody among them have been quoted giving preference to Ali over Abubakar and Umar. Generally the first Shia love Ali and gave precedence to Abubakar and Umar over him, but there is a group among them who give

precedence over Uthman. People during the tribulation (civil war) became two Shias (parties), the party of Ali and the party of Uthman and not all those who fought on the side of Ali prefer him over Uthman, nay most of them give precedence to Uthman over him and this is the belief of all Ahlus Sunnah.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT AHLUS SUNNAH SCHOLARS ARE SHIA ADHERENTS IN THEIR HEARTS

The Rafidi stated: “A lot of times we come across those who believe in the Imamiyyah creed in their hearts but they are prevented from showing it by love of the world and looking for position or authority. I have seen some scholars of Hanbaliyyah school of jurisprudence saying: ‘I am on the creed of Imamiyyah.’ I asked him: ‘Why are you teaching Hanbaliyyah jurisprudence?’ He replied: ‘In your school of thought there are no material goods and fame.’ And the biggest scholar of Shafi’i school of jurisprudence of our time, made will before his death that a Shia Imamiyyah adherent shall wash his dead body and prepare it for burial and that he shall be buried at the shrine of our master al-Khazim. I give testimony that he is in the Shia Imamiyyah school of thought.”

The reply is: Surely his words: “A lot of times we come across...,” is a lie, nay we might have some people who belonged to the Ahlus Sunnah who is in his heart a Rafidi, [\[77\]](#) just as we have some people who claimed to be Muslims but in their hearts they are hypocrites. Surely Shia Rafidah are of the species of hypocrites who are hiding their creed because they need to dissimulate other than that, just like the way the hypocrites need to dissimulate belief rather than unbelief; and you will never find this but among those who are ignorant of the condition of the Prophet (s.a.w) and how the affairs of Muslims have been in the beginning of Islam, but whoever knows how Islam has been and he accepted it both openly and in his heart; that there is nobody worthy of being worshipped but Allah and Muhammad (s.a.w) is His Messenger, he will never be a Rafidi in his heart except an atheist hypocrite or an ignorant of how Islam has been; an extreme in ignorance.

I was informed by some people from Bagdad that the story he mentioned about that teacher is a fabricated lie. We are not denying that among Ahlus Sunnah there is someone who is an unbeliever, or

an atheist who has apostate from Islam, let alone becoming a Rafidi! Whoever attests the atheism of some people in their hearts as a proof that all Muslims scholars are atheists is the most ignorant of all men and likewise whoever attest that some people are Shia Rafidites and applied that upon all people.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ACCUSED AHLUS SUNNAH OF PARTISANSHIP WITHOUT RIGHT

The Rafidi stated: “Shia Imamiyyah do not act on partisanship without right in contrast to others. Ghazali and Mawurdi who are two scholars of Shafi’iyyah mentioned that flattening of the top of graves has been decreed by law, but because Shia Rafidah has turned it into their practice we left it and prefer making the top part of the grave into ridge shape. Zamakshari – who was a scholar of Hanafiyyah – mentioned in his exegesis of the Qur’an, where Allah said: **‘He it is Who sends Salat (His blessings) on you, and His angels too (ask Allah to bless and forgive you), that He may bring you out from darkness (of disbelief and polytheism) into light (of Belief and Islamic Monotheism). And He is Ever Most Merciful to the believers’ (33:43).** He explained that it is allowed by the implied meaning of this verse to ask Allah to bless individual Muslims, but because the Rafidah apply it on their Imams, we prevented it. The author of ‘al-Hidayah’ of the Hanbali School of jurisprudence stated that: The Sunnah on wearing ring is to wear it on the right hand, but because Rafidah are doing that we changed it to the left hand. There are many more examples: Thus, look at the ones who changed the laws and altered the decrees that have been announced by the Prophet (s.a.w) and goes against right conduct in opposition to a particular people. Is it allowed to follow him and work with his words?”

The answer is from two perspectives: Firstly, what he has mentioned more deserved and suited the conducts of Rafidah.^[78] Secondly, scholars of Ahlus Sunnah are free from these types of conduct; these will be explained further:

With regard to the first reply: We say, we do not know any group that displays partisanship and bigotry in falsehood more than Rafida, to the extent that they are known to give false witness against their opponents in order to support their belief. As far as partisanship is concerned, there is nothing greater than lies (and they are the greatest liars). It is because of partisanship that they allocated all

inheritance to girl child, so that they can be able to say: Fatima inherited all the properties of the Prophet (s.a.w) to the exclusion of his uncle Abbas (and his wives). The Shia Rafidah went to the extent of forbidding upon themselves the meat of camels because Aisha (r.a) fought on a camel's back and by this they have contradicted the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of his Messenger (s.a.w), the consensus of the companions (r.a) and the consensus of the Prophet's progeny and family due to a matter that is not related to that. After all the camel upon which Aisha (r.a) mounted is dead and even if we assume that it is still alive; then just because unbelievers are riding camels does not make its meat forbidden. Unbelievers are still riding camels and Muslims acquire them through war booties and its meat is permitted for them to eat. What is the relation of Aisha (r.a) riding a camel and making its meat disallowed to consume? Their extreme assumption is that some people that they are calling unbelievers have mounted a camel; although they are liars and slanderers in what they are ascribing against the mother of believers.

It is part of their bigotry and partisanship that they do not mention the number "ten" (for their hatred of the ten companions promised Paradise) instead of that they say nine and one and if they erect pillars (for their homes etc.) they do not make it ten and they are very careful on that in many other affairs.

It is part of their bigotry and partisanship that whenever they meet a man whose name is Ali or Hasan or Husain or Abbas they quickly honor him although he might be a profligate or a Sunnah adherent for Ahlus Sunnah used those names; all of these are bigotry, partisanship and ignorance. It is their bigotry that they hated all Bani Umayyah because some of them have fought Imam Ali (r.a). There are righteous people among Bani Umayyah who died before the civil war (tribulation). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) appointed more men of Bani Umayyah than any other Arab clan to positions of authority. After the conquest of Makka he appointed 'Attab bin Usaid as the governor of Makka, he appointed Khalid bin Sa'id and his two brothers 'Abban bin Sa'id and Sa'id bin Sa'id to other duties, he appointed Abu Sufyan bin Harb or his son Yazid as governors of

Najran and he died as its governor. The Messenger of Allah has been an in-law to Bani Umayyah and he gave three of his daughters in marriage to men of Bani Umayyah; he married his first daughter Zainab to Abil 'As bi Rabi'e bin Umayyah and he praised his in-law when Ali desired to marry the daughter of Abu Jahal by mentioning him and praising him as a good in law saying: ***"He talked to me and spoke the truth and he promised me and fulfill his promise."*** He married his two daughters to Uthman (r.a) one after the other and when the second one died he said: ***"If we have a third one we will marry her to Uthman."***

It is part of their bigotry that they hated the people of Syria because, firstly there have been in it people who hated Ali – it is well known that there have been believers and unbelievers in Makka and in Madina there have been believers and hypocrites - although there is nobody today in it who is showing enmity to Imam Ali (r.a), but because of their extreme hatred they are still holding the people of Syria as enemies. It is also part of their bigotry that they censured whoever benefitted from legacies of Bani Umayyah such drinking water from river Yazid (Yazid did not dug the river but he widen it) or praying in a mosque that has been built by Bani Umayyah; and it is well known that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) used to pray to the Ka'abah that has been built by the polytheists, live in houses that they built, drink water from wells that they dug, wear the clothes they weaved and transact with money that they minted. Thus if he benefitted from their homes, clothing, water that they dug and mosques that they built; what can you say about what Muslims produced?

If we assume that Yazid is an unbeliever and he dug a channel, then drinking from it is not reprehensible by consensus of Muslims, but due to their extreme bigotry and partisanship, they hated what is ascribed to the one they hated. A reliable man informed me that one of them has a dog and one of them called it Bakir. Owner of the dog said: Do you call my dog with the name of one of the denizens of Fire? They fought due to that to the extent of wounding each other. Then, who is more ignorant (and bigot) than those people?

With regard to the second reply we say: What is believed by the Muslims scholars is that anything that has been decreed by Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w) cannot be abandoned because people of innovation are practicing it; neither because of Rafidah nor any other sect. This is the consensus of Ahlus Sunnah in their principles of jurisprudence (and is their practice). With regard to the question of flattening graves which he has mentioned: The schools of jurisprudence of Ahmad and Abu Hanifa stated that ridging is preferred because a sound hadith stated that the grave of the Prophet (s.a.w) was ridged and because ridge shape is the farthest away from looking like a worldly edifice, in addition to the fact that it prevent people from turning it into a seat. Imam Shafi'i preferred flattening due to the hadith that commanded leveling graves for he take leveling to mean flattening,; some of his students said that this is the conduct of Rafidah and hence it is detested, but the majority of his students rejected the opinion of those minority saying: Nay, it is recommended even if Rafidah are doing the same thing.

The same argument was raised with regard to reading the Bismillah (In the Name of Allah) loudly in prayer and some people talked against Imam Shafi'i due to that and because of Qunut; because those acts are ascribed to Rafidah and Qadriyyah; it is well known in Iraq that those are the signs of Rafidah and that reciting Qunut^[79] at morning prayers is ascribed to Rafidah and Qadriyyah to the extent that Sufyan ath-Thauri and some other scholars mentioned in their discusses abandonment of reciting Bismillah loudly because according to them it is of the signs of Rafidah.^[80] Despite the opinion of those scholars since reading loudly is practiced by some companions, Imam Shafi'i mentioned it in his school of thought, although it has agreed with the acts of Rafidah. Imam Shafi'i also maintained the desirability of wearing the garment of Ihram from 'Aqiq by the pilgrim even though it is the practice of Rafidah. There are many other examples on similar questions.

SEGMENT: ON MENTIONING THE RIGHT GUIDED CALIPHS DURING SERMON

The Rafidi stated: “They (Ahlus Sunnah) innovated some things and confessed that they are innovations and the Prophet (s.a.w) has said: ***‘Every innovation is misguidance and every misguidance is in Hell-Fire.’*** The Prophet also said: ***‘Whoever innovated in our religion what does not belong to it is rejected.’*** If they are asked to stop those innovations, their hearts will hate it and their souls will reject it. Some of those innovations are like their mentioning of the right guided Caliphs in their sermons, although by consensus that has not been the practice at the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and neither at the time of the companions and the Tabi’un nor at the time of the Ummayyad Caliphate nor the beginning of the Abbasid Caliphate. It is something innovated by Caliph Mansur when there occurred between him and the descendants of Imam Ali misunderstanding, he said: I will spite myself and spite them by raising over them Bani Taym (clan of Abubakar) and Bani ‘Ady (clan of Umar). He thereafter mentioned the companions in his sermons and this innovation continued to this period.”

We say: The reply is from many angles:

Firstly: It said that mentioning the Caliphs was started during the time of Umar bin Abdulaziz, nay it had been narrated that it was started during the time of Umar bin Khattab.

Secondly: It is said that Umar bin Abdulaziz mentioned the four Caliphs in sermon because some Bani Umayyah have been cursing Ali, so he changed that to mentioning the Caliphs and supplicating for them and beseeching Allah to be pleased with them. He does so in order to erase that bad custom.

Thirdly: His mentioning that, that was innovated by Caliph Mansur for the purpose he mentioned is false. This is because Abubakar and Umar have been Calips before Mansur and before Bani Umayyah, therefore there is nothing in mentioning them that entailed spiting himself and spiting the descendants of Imam Ali, except if some men

from Bani Taym or Bani 'Adi are disputing with them for the Caliphate and nobody from those clans has disputed with them on the Caliphate.

Fourthly: Undoubtedly, Ahlus Sunnah are not saying that mentioning the four Caliphs in a sermon is obligatory, nay what they are saying is; mentioning only Ali or mentioning the twelve Imams is the most reprehensible innovation that has not been committed by anybody among the companions or the Tabi'un or Bani Umayyah or Bani Abbas; in the same way as they are saying cursing Imam Ali or any other person from among the predecessors is a reprehensible innovation. If mentioning the four Caliphs is an innovation, although many among the past Caliphs have done so, then mentioning Imam Ali exclusively although nobody has done so among the predecessors more deserved to be an innovation and if mentioning Imam Ali because he has been Commander of the Faithfull is desirable, then mentioning the four that have been the rightly guided Caliphs more deserved to be desirable. The fact is that Rafidah are among those who tilt the scale (instead of balancing it): One of them sees dirt in the eyes of Ahlus Sunnah but he would not see the trunk (of tree) that poke his eyes.

It is well known that all Muslims have agreed upon the first three Caliphs and at their times weapons are directed against the unbelievers (and enemies of Islam) and restrained against the Muslims, in contrast to the Caliphate of Imam Ali for Muslims did not have consensus on giving him vow of allegiance. Nay, tribulation (civil war) set in at that period and weapons at that time are directed against Muslim. Thus, if one confined himself to mentioning Imam Ali alone and excluded his predecessors; he has abandoned mentioning the leaders of Muslims and the periods of Islamic unity and Muslims victory against their enemies and restricted himself to mentioning the leader of the period of Muslims disunity and the time when unbelievers covet their land (and wish to overcome them).

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON WIPING LEGS IN RITUAL ABLUTION

The Rafidi stated: “Like wiping on the legs which Allah mentioned in His Glorious Books, where he said: **‘O you who believe! When you intend to offer As-Salat (the prayer), wash your faces and your hands (forearms) up to the elbows, rub (by passing wet hands over) your heads, and (wash) your feet up to ankles’ (5:6).** And Ibn Abbas said: ‘two limbs are washed and two limbs are wiped.’ But they changed it and made washing legs obligatory.”

We reply saying: Those who transmitted and conveyed from the Prophet (s.a.w) how to perform ritual ablution by words and by action and those who learned how to perform ritual ablution from him at his time and performed it while he is seeing them and he affirmed them on that method and thereafter they conveyed it to their students and those who come after them are greater in number than those who conveyed the odd version of reciting that verse (which the Shia are clinging on).^[81] Surely all Muslims have been performing ablution during his time and they did not learn it from anybody other than him and they do not know anything about this type ritual before the advent of Islam. They have seen him performing ablution uncountable times and they transmitted from him washing the legs through many hadiths to the extent of conveying to him some sound narrations which contains his warnings (to his community for not washing the whole legs: He said: ***“Woe unto the heels and soles of the foot from the Fire.”***

If wiping top of the foot is what is obligatory, then washing all the leg will be an inconvenience that is not desired by human nature, in such a manner that human nature sought for power and authority and wealth. If it right for Shia Rafidah to say: They all made mistake or lied in what they have transmitted from him, then lying and mistake is more closer, more deserved and more possible with regard to the odd and unreliable recitation of the Qur’an they are clinging on. If they argue that - though falsely – the recitation of the verse is concurrently reported; surely, establishment of the concurrent

transmission of sound hadiths from the Prophet (s.a.w) with regard to ablution is more perfect and more deserved to be free from error. And again, expression of that odd recitation of the Qur'an does not contradict the concurrent Sunnah because the word wiping (مسح Mashun) in Arabic language has many meanings which included washing and wiping and those words are used interchangeably each encompassing each other.

There is in the Qur'an evidence that proved that washing the whole leg is what is required in ablution because the verse stated: “...**and your feet up to ankles...**’ Thus Allah the Most High commanded the Mashun (washing) to be up to the two ankle bones and those who wipe only wipes on part of the foot.

Concurrent Sunnah has been conveyed from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) with regard to wiping on socks and washing the legs, but Shia Rafidah are contradicting them, the same as Kharijites contradicted similar issues because they think that they have contradicted the apparent (literal) expressions of the meaning of the Qur'an. Nay concurrent narrations that are conveyed from the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning wiping on socks and washing the legs are greater than those of cutting the hand of a thief who steal one fourth of a Dinar or a third of a Dinar or Ten Dirhams.

Summarily there is nothing in the Qur'an denying the obligation of washing the legs in ablution, nay there is in it the obligation of washing the legs. If we assume that the Sunnah has made obligatory an additional act over what the Qur'an made imperative that does not entail denying what the Qur'an made obligatory; then how about if it (the Sunnah) interpreted it (the verse) and explained its meanings. [\[82\]](#)

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE TWO MUT'AHs

The Rafidi stated: "Like the two Mut'ahs that have been mentioned in the Qur'an. Allah the Most High said concerning the Mut'ah^[83] of pilgrimage: **"and whosoever performs the 'Umrah in the months of Hajj, before (performing) the Hajj..." (2:196)** The prophet was distressed for not performing it when he performed the pilgrimage with Qiran.^[84] With regard to mut'ah of women, Allah the Most High said: **"... So with those of whom you have enjoyed sexual relations, give them their Mahr (dowry) as prescribed; but if after a Mahr is prescribed, you agree mutually (to give more), there is no sin on you. Surely, Allah is Ever All Knowing, All-Wise" (4:24).** They continued to perform the two Mut'ahs at the time of the Prophet (s.a.w), during the Caliphate of Abubakar (r.a) and part of the Caliphate of Umar (r.a), until when Umar (r.a) mounted the pulpit and said: 'There are two Mut'ah that have been allowed during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w), but I am forbidding them and will punish whoever commit them.'"

The answers to the above contentions are as follows: With regard to the Mut'ah of pilgrimage; there is consensus and full agreement among the Muslims scholars about its permissibility and his claim that Ahlus Sunnah innovates its forbiddance is a lie against them. Nay, most of the Ahlus Sunnah scholars preferred it over Qiran or make it compulsory; most of the scholars such as Imam Ahmad and other scholars of hadith, Imam Abu Hanifa and other scholars of Iraq, Imam Shafi'i in one of his opinions and other scholars of Makka gives preference to Mut'ah of pilgrimage (over Qiran).

With regard to the Mut'ah of women which is being contested there is nothing in that verse of the Qur'an explicitly allowing it. Allah the Most High said: **"Also (forbidden are) women already married, except those (captives and slaves) whom your right hands possess. Thus has Allah ordained for you. All others are lawful, provided you seek (them in marriage) with Mahr (bridal money given by the husband to his wife at the time of marriage) from your property, desiring chastity, not committing illegal sexual**

intercourse, so with those of whom you have enjoyed sexual relations, give them their Mahr as prescribed; but if after a Mahr is prescribed, you agree mutually (to give more), there is no sin on you. Surely, Allah is Ever All Knowing, AllWise. And whoever of you have not the means wherewith to wed free, believing women, they may wed believing girls from among those (captives and slaves) whom your right hands possess, and Allah has full knowledge about your Faith, you are one from another. Wed them with the permission of their own folk (guardians, Auliya' or masters) and give them their Mahr according to what is reasonable; they (the above said captive and slave-girls) should be chaste, not adulterous, nor taking boy-friends. And after they have been taken in wedlock, if they commit illegal sexual intercourse, their punishment is half that for free (unmarried) women. This is for him among you who is afraid of being harmed in his religion or in his body; but it is better for you that you practice self-restraint, and Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful" (4:24-25).

The phrase: "... Those whom you have enjoyed sexual relation..." (4:24), is talking about any woman who her husband has consummated the marriage (and has not yet paid the dowry), and Allah is commanding the husband to give the woman all her dowry in contrast to a woman who is divorced before consummating the marriage for she deserved only half of the agreed upon dowry. This is like the words of Allah: **"And how could you take it (back) while you have gone in unto each other, and they have taken from you a firm and strong covenant? (4:21).** Thus, paying full dowry (and not taking it back unjustly) has been made obligatory once the marriage contract has taken place and the marriage has been consummated. Therefore, this verse is talking about permanent marriage as has been further explained by the verse for immediately after mentioning that, it discussed marriage to maids (women under bondage) and by that it is clear that what has been mentioned before marriage to maids is generally talking about marriage to free women.

If one say: Among the predecessors there are those who recite the verse as follows: “Those with whom you enjoyed sexual intercourse for stated period...” We reply: This recitation is not concurrent and if it is ever sound; its extent is that it is a hadith Ahad (a lone hadith). We do not deny that Mut’ah was allowed at the beginning of Islam (just like drinking wine, but they are all forbidden later on).

With regard to what he mentioned that Umar (r.a) forbids Mut’ah; then that is not true for it has been confirmed and attested that the Prophet (s.a.w) is the one who prohibited it. This has been narrated by reliable scholars in both Bukhari and Muslim and other compendiums of hadith. From Zuhri on the authority of Abdullah and Hasan the children of Muhammad bin Ali bin Abi Talib (Ibn Hanafiyyah) on the authority of their father and on the authority of Ali bin Abi Talib who narrated to Ibn Abbas when he permitted Mut’ah saying: ***“You are an erred man, surely the Messenger of Allah has forbidden Mut’ah and the meet of donkey in the year of Khaibar campaign” (Bukhari and Muslim).*** It also comes in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) has forbidden it forever. Those who narrated the hadith of Ali (r.a) differed on the phrase: “In the year of Khaibar campaign,” is it the time when only meet of donkey was forbidden or is it the time when both Mut’ah and the meet of donkeys were forbidden!! The first opinion is the statement of Ibn ‘Uyainah and some scholar. Those who took the second opinion said that it was forbidden, then allowed, then forbidden again. A third group said it was allowed again and then forbidden during the time of the farewell pilgrimage.

There are concurrent narrations attesting each other that Mut’ah was forbidden after it was allowed (just like wine) and the correct verdict is that after it was forbidden it is never allowed again and that it was forbidden in the year of the conquest of Makka and it is never allowed again after that. It was not forbidden in the year of Khaibair, nay in that the year the meat of domestic donkeys was prohibited. Ibn Abbas used to allow Mut’ah and the meat of donkeys, so Imam Ali objected that against him and said to him: Surely the Prophet (s.a.w) has forbidden Mut’ah of women and forbids eating the meat

of donkey in the year of Khaibar. Imam Ali mentioned the two issues together because he was informed that Ibn Abbas is permitting both of them. It has been narrated that Ibn Abbas has abandoned his opinion when the hadith that forbids it reached him.^[85]

Thus Ahlus Sunnah are following Imam Ali and other rightly guided Caliphs in what he has narrated on the authority of the Prophet (s.a.w) in contrast to Shia who have contradicted Imam Ali (r.a) and follow the views of other than him.

Again, Allah the Most High only allowed in His Book permanent marriage and women in bondage (slaves) that a person possess and women under Mut'ah is not one of those two. This is because if she is a wife there will be inheritance between them, waiting period for the wife after death of the husband will have been compulsory upon her and she will have deserved three divorces; those are (some of) laws of a wife in the Book of Allah and since exigencies of marriage are absent in Mut'ah it entailed that that is not a valid marriage; surely the absence of exigencies entailed nullity of the obligated. Allah in His Book allowed marriage and what the right hand possess and forbids whatever is added to that: **“And those who guard their chastity (i.e. private parts, from illegal sexual acts). Except from their wives or (the captives and slaves) that their right hands possess, for then, they are free from blame; But whoever seeks beyond that, then those are the transgressors”** (23:4-7).^[86]

A woman after Mut'ah was prohibited is neither a wife nor a slave woman and thus it is forbidden by the text of the Qur'an (and the Sunnah of His Prophet) and she is not a wife because all the exigencies of a married woman are null with regard to her.^[87]

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE ACCUSATION THAT ABUBAKAR REFUSED TO GIVE FATIMA HER INHERITANCE

The Rafidi stated: “Abubakar refused to give Fatima (r.a) her inheritance and she said to him: Do you inherit your father while I do not inherit mine? He mentioned a hadith, which only he himself knew – and he is a rival to her for charity is permitted for him – he said: The Prophet said: ‘We Prophets do not leave inheritance whatever we left behind are for charity.’ What he narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w) has contradicted the Qur’an, for Allah the Most High said: **“Allah commands you as regard to your children’s (inheritance); to the male a portion equal to that of two women...” (4:11).** Allah the Exalted did not make this decree to the whole community to his exclusion. Allah denied his narration when He said: **“And Solomon inherited David...” (27:16).** Allah the Most High also said concerning Zachariah: **“And Verily! I fear my relatives after me, since my wife is barren. So give me from Yourself an heir; who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Jacob. And make him, my Lord, one with whom You are Well-pleased!”(19:5-6).**

Reply to the above contention is from many perspectives:

Firstly: He claimed that Fatima said: “Do you inherit your father and I do not inherit mine?” The soundness of this statement coming from her is unknown and if it is a sound statement, then it is not a proof or evidence, because her father (s.a.w) cannot be compared to anybody among mankind and Abubakar is not closer to the believers than their own selves like her father (s.a.w); he is not among those forbidden to accept voluntary and compulsory charities like her father (s.a.w) and he is not among those who Allah make their love ahead and above that of the self, the family and wealth like her father (s.a.w).

One of the differences between Prophets and the rest of mankind is that Allah protected them from leaving behind worldly riches as

inheritance (to their children), so that there will not be any excuse for the one who want to find fault to their Prophethood to say that: They work and seek for the world and left riches as inheritance for their children. As for Abubakar and other people like him, they are not Prophets, so they will not be accused with similar accusations. In like manner, Allah also protected his Prophet from saying poetry and inscription (and reading) in order to protect him from accusations although other people did not need such protection.

Secondly: The Rafidi stated: “He mentioned a hadith which only he himself knew...”^[88] We reply: This is a lie because the statement of the Prophet: ***“We do not leave inheritance and what we left is charity,”*** has been reported by Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Talha, Zubair, Sa’ad, Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf, Abbas bin Abdulmutallab, wives of the Prophet and Abu Hurairah. Sound narrations on the authority of those people have been recorded in all the known hadith compendiums. Therefore, for anybody to say that it is only Abubakar who narrated it; only showed his crass, extreme ignorance or purposeful intention to tell lies.

Thirdly: His words: “He is a rival to her.” This is a lie, because Abubakar did not utilize or spent that money for his personal use or for members of family, nay it is charity for those who deserved it in like manner that mosques are for all Muslims.

Fourthly: Abubakar has never been among those who need charity for he is self sufficient, and neither himself nor any of his family benefit from that charity. He is just like a person who some wealthy men attested that he has made will for charity in favor of the poor; this type of testimony is acceptable by consensus (of all men of knowledge and intellect).

Fifthly: If there is anything that will benefit a narrator of hadith among the companions his narration will be accepted because this is an issue pertaining to narration of knowledge and an issue related to giving testimony (i.e. before a judge). If a speaker narrated a hadith before a judge on an issue between him and his opponent, the hadith that he has narrated will be accepted because the hadith

contained general law which involved the narrator and other people. This is related to giving information, like a person giving testimony that he has seen the crescent moon; surely whatever the Prophet (s.a.w) commanded encompasses the narrator and other people, the same is the case with whatever he forbids or allows.

This hadith contained statement with a decreed law and that is why it also entailed the forbiddance of the inheritance to the daughter of Abubakar, Aisha (r.a), (Hafsa the daughter of Umar and all the Prophet's wives and his uncle Abbas), it also comprises that it is prohibited for him to buy this inheritance (the property) and then return it to them (the heirs) as a gift from himself and it also included the obligation of spending that money on charity.

Sixthly: The Rafidi stated: "What is in the Qur'an contradicted what he said, because Allah said: **'Allah commands you as regard to your children's (inheritance); to the male a portion equal to that of two women...'** (4:11). He did not make that specific to the Muslim community excluding the Prophet."

We reply: Firstly: There is nothing in the general expression of the verse what indicated that Prophets are inherited. Allah the Most High said: **"Allah commands you as regards your children's (inheritance); to the male, a portion equal to that of two females; if (there are) only daughters, two or more, their share is two thirds of the inheritance; if only one, her share is half. For parents, a sixth share of inheritance to each if the deceased left children; if no children, and the parents are the (only) heirs, the mother has a third; if the deceased left brothers or (sisters), the mother has a sixth. (The distribution in all cases is) after the payment of legacies he may have bequeathed or debts. You know not which of them, whether your parents or your children, are nearest to you in benefit, (these fixed shares) are ordained by Allah. And Allah is Ever AllKnower, AllWise. In that which your wives leave, your share is a half if they have no child; but if they leave a child, you get a fourth of that which they leave after payment of legacies that they may have bequeathed or**

debts. In that which you leave, their (your wives) share is a fourth if you leave no child; but if you leave a child, they get an eighth of that which you leave after payment of legacies that you may have bequeathed or debts. If the man or woman whose inheritance is in question has left neither ascendants nor descendants, but has left a brother or a sister, each one of the two gets a sixth; but if more than two, they share in a third; after payment of legacies he (or she) may have bequeathed or debts, so that no loss is caused (to anyone). This is a Commandment from Allah; and Allah is Ever All-knowing, Most Forbearing” (4:11-12). This statement comprises all those who are addressed by it and there is nothing in it showing that the Prophet (s.a.w) is addressed by it.

Seventhly: The fact that Prophets are not inherited has been established by sound Sunnah, and consensus of the companions and each of those is definite proof and thus it cannot be opposed with what they think is a general rule and even if it is a general decree, it has been specified. This is because if it is a proof (that Prophets are inherited), then it is speculative proof and speculative proof cannot oppose definite evidence; that narration has been narrated by many companions at different periods and in many places publicly and none of them deny it, nay all of them accepted it with certainty. This is why nobody among his wives insisted that inheritance shall be given to her and his uncle Abbas did not insist that he must be given inheritance (of the son of his brother), nay whoever ask for something of that , he is informed of the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he withdrew his request (satisfied). This is the situation throughout the period of the rightly guided Caliphs (including Ali), nothing of that is changed and what he left has never been divided to them.

Eighthly: Surely Abubakar and Umar gave Ali and his children a lot of money more than what the Prophet (s.a.w) left behind of property. The properties that the Prophet (s.a.w) left has not been utilized by them for personal benefits, nay Umar (r.a) handed it over to Abbas and Ali to administer it and do what the Prophet (s.a.w) used to do

with it when he was alive. This nullified any accusation against them in that direction. And again, if we assume that Abubakar and Umar take over authority by force, then the normal thing that is done in such a state is that they will not deny inheritance to them, but instead they will give them additional properties and wealth so that they will not contest authority with them and so that they will be conciliated.

Ninthly: With regard to the words of Allah: **“And Solomon inherited David...” (27:16)**. And what Allah the Most High also said concerning Zachariah: **“And Verily! I fear my relatives after me, since my wife is barren. So give me from Yourself an heir; who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Jacob. And make him, my Lord, one with whom You are Well-pleased!” (19:5-6)**. These verses are not the bond of contention because “Irth” (inheritance) is a generatic noun which has many meanings and that which indicated association does not indicate specification for if it is said that: This is an animal; it does not specify (the type of animal) whether it is a man, or a horse or a donkey. Likewise the word “inheritance” is used for inheritance of knowledge or Prophethood or Kingship etc. Allah said: **“Then We gave the Book the Quran) for inheritance to such of Our slaves whom We chose. Then of them are some who wrong their ownelves, and of them are some who follow a middle course, and of them are some who are, by Allah's Leave, foremost in good deeds. That (inheritance of the Quran), that is indeed a great grace” (35:32)**. In another place Allah the Most High said: **“These are indeed the inheritors. Who shall inherit the Firdaus (Paradise). They shall dwell therein forever” (23:10-11)**.

The Messenger of Allah said: ***“... Indeed the scholars are the inheritors of the prophets, for the prophets do not leave behind a Dinar or a Dirham for inheritance, but rather they leave behind knowledge. So whoever takes hold of it has acquired a large share (of inheritance)” (Ahmad, Abu Dawud and others)***.

Tenthly: We say what is meant by that is the inheritance of knowledge and Prophethood etc. and not inheritance of money and

properties, this is because Allah said: **“And Solomon inherited (the knowledge of) Dawud (David). He said: "O mankind! We have been taught the language of birds, and on us have been bestowed all things. This, verily, is an evident grace (from Allah)” (27:16).** It is well known that Prophet David (a.s) has many children other than Prophet Solomon (a.s) and thus, Solomon alone cannot inherit all his properties. Again, leaving his properties as inheritance is neither a praiseworthy conduct to Prophet David (a.s) nor to Prophet Solomon (a.s) for any Jew or Christian leave money as inheritance for his son and the verse is in the context of praising Prophet Solomon (a.s) and what Allah specifically bestowed upon of him of grace and felicity.

Leaving properties as inheritance is one of the natural things that is associated to all human beings, like eating food, drinking and burying the dead and these types of things are not mentioned with regard to Prophets because there is no benefit in mentioning it. What has benefit is related concerning them due to the lessons it contained which shall be learned, otherwise the statement of a speaker: i.e. “so and so has died and his son inherited his wealth” or “they buried him” or “they ate, drank and slept,” and similar statements are not among the stories of the Qur’an.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON FATIMA'S REQUEST FOR FADAK AND RELATED ISSUES

The Rafidi stated: "When Fatima mentioned that her father has given her (the farm in) Fadak. He (Abubakar) said to her: 'Bring your witnesses.' She brought Um 'Aiman who attested for her. But he said: 'A woman, we will not accept her words.' This despite the fact that the Prophet (s.a.w) has said: 'Um 'Aiman is a woman of the denizens of Paradise.' Imam Ali come and gave testimony for her. But he said: 'This is your husband who is just drawing the property to himself, we cannot judge for you with his testimony.' All of them have narrated that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with him wherever he turns, they will not be separated until they meet me at the cistern.' Fatima became angry and went away and she swore that she will never speak to him or to his companion until she meet her father and complain to him. When she is about to die she asked Ali to bury her in the night and that he shall not allow anyone of them to pray for her. All of them have reported that the Prophet said: 'O Fatima, Allah is angry with your anger and He is pleased with your pleasure.' And all of them reported that he said: 'Fatima is a part of me, whoever harmed her has really harmed me and whoever harmed me has really harmed Allah.'

If that statement is truly sound, he would not have left the mule, sword and turban that the Prophet left with Ali and he would not have judged their possession in favor of Ali when Abbas claimed them. That would have entailed that the Prophet's family who Allah has cleansed in His Book has committed what is wrong, because charity is forbidden for them. After that properties arrived from Bahrain and at that time Jabir bin Abdullah al-Ansari is in his company and he said: 'The Prophet (s.a.w) said to me; if the properties of Bahrain arrive I will fill my hands and give you, fill my hands and give you – three times. Abubakar said to him: 'Take according to that measure.' So he took from the Muslims treasury without witness; just by his words."

We reply: The above statement contained lies, slander, and corrupt words that cannot be enumerated but with great effort and exertion, but we will mention some replies to it – by the will of Allah the Most High:

Firstly: What he has now claimed that Fatima has requested Fadak because it is a gift given to her by her father (s.a.w) has contradicted his earlier claim that it is her inheritance. If she is claiming it by way of gift, then the way of inheritance is null. If the gift is given during his terminal illness, then know that the Prophet (s.a.w) is absolved, free and protected from committing such acts – that is if he inherited like other people – that he made a will for a heir or gave him during his terminal illness something greater than his right and if he (made the gift) in a state of good health, then such a gift must have been collected (by the beneficiary); otherwise if someone give a gift by words and the person who was given did not collect it up to the time when the giver or donor died, then such a gift is null by the verdict of majority scholars. Then how can the Prophet (s.a.w) give Fadak to Fatima (r.a) and such an affair will not be known by his family and all the Muslims except Um ‘Aiman and Ali (r.a)?

Secondly: Stating the Fatima (r.a) has made such a claim is a lie against her and the narration brought forward to support such a claim is a fabricated hadith. What is sound is that Fatima asked Abubakar her inheritance and he mentioned to her what the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“We do not leave inheritance...”*** Nobody mentioned in a sound hadith that she claimed something other than inheritance and nobody has given testimony to other than that. It was narrated by Mughirah on the authority of Umar bin Abdulaziz, who said: ***“Fatima asked the Prophet to allocate to her a portion of what is realized from Fadak but he refused and that the Prophet (s.a.w) used to spend the returns of that farm on the poor of Bani Hashim and marry out with it the orphans, among them. Returns on the farm are spent on charity during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w) and Fatima accepted the truth. I gave testimony before you that I have reversed its use to what it is employed during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w).”***

Nobody heard that Fatima has claimed that the Prophet (s.a.w) gave her the farm as gift in any reliable, sound hadith with connected chain of narrators and nobody give such a testimony for her. If the matter has been like that it would have been narrated for it would have been an apparent dispute in the community and something talked about. It was narrated that Umar stated: “that the Prophet (s.a.w) used to have three properties from war booties: In Bani Nadir, Khaibar and Fadak. The farm in Bani Nadir was dedicated to some vicissitudes, that of Fadak was dedicated to wayfarers and that of Khaibar is divided into three parts; two parts are dedicated to poor Muslims and one part was dedicated to his family expenses and whatever is in excess of the need of his family he spend it on the poor among the Muhajirun in two parts.”

In another hadith ‘Urwah said Aisha has informed him that Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet (s.a.w) sent to Abubakar asking him about her inheritance from what Allah has bestowed to him of properties in Madina, Fadak and Khaibar. Abubakar said: ***‘The Messenger of Allah said: ‘We are not inherited and what we left is charity.’ The family of Muhammad (s.a.w) can benefit from those properties. I swear by Allah I will not change anything of the charity of the Prophet (s.a.w) from the condition it has been during his life time. I will surely do with it what the Prophet used to do with it. Abubakar thus refused give her anything from it as inheritance’*** (Bukhari, Muslim).^[89]

Anas (r.a) reported that Fatima spoke to Abubakar and he said to her: ***“...To me you are reliable and truthful, so if the Prophet (s.a.w) has promised you anything of it, or gave it to you or apportioned some returns from it to be given to you by right, inform me and I will believe you. She said: No, but when the verse of sharing booty was revealed he said: ‘Be gladdened O family of Muhammad for Allah has enriched you.’ Abubakar replied: ‘Allah and His Messenger has spoken the truth, you have also spoken the truth, you have the war booty (in which no war took place) and to my knowledge not all of it shall be given to you, but you will be given sufficiently (out of it).’”*** This

explained that Abubakar used to accept her words without any witness. Therefore, how can anybody claim that he rejected the witness of a man and a woman? But this Rafidi just cling unto anything he can find.

Thirdly: If the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is inherited the opposing parties on that issue are his wives and his uncle and the testimony of a man or a woman will not be accepted by the decree of the Book of Allah, His Prophet and the consensus of the Muslims, and if he is not inherited the opponents in that case are all the Muslims and in this case also the attestation of a man or a woman will not be accepted, so also the attestation of a man and a woman.

Yes! In such a situation a verdict can be given with the testimony of one person and the oath of the claimant, according to scholars of the Hijaz (Arabian Peninsular) and jurist among hadith scholars. There are two main opinions among jurists with regard to the testimony of a husband for his wife. Imam Ahmad has recorded the two opinions and one of them is that it is rejected, and this is the opinion of Imam Abu Hanifa, Malik, Laith bin Sa'ad, al-'Auza'i, and Ishaq etcetera. The second opinion is that it is acceptable and this is the opinion of Iman Shafi'i, Abu Thaur, and Ibn Munzir etcetera. Based on these, if we assumed the soundness of that story, it is not enough for a ruler to judge with the attestation of one man or one woman by consensus of Muslims, especially when you consider that most of them do not accept the testimony of the husband. Among those scholars there are those who do not judge with a witness and oath and those who judge with witness and oath will not judge for the claimant until he make him swear to an oath.

Fourthly: The Rafidi stated: "Um 'Aiman come and attested for her. He said: A woman, her words are not accepted. All of them have narrated that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Um 'Aiman is a woman from the denizens of Paradise."

We reply: This is an argument of a person who is extremely ignorant. He wanted to argue for himself but he ended up arguing against himself. If Hajjaj bin Yusuf or Mukhtar bin Abi 'Ubaid and their like

(among despots) make similar statements, they would have spoken the truth. Surely, a lone woman's testimony cannot be accepted in judgment concerning a property that has been claimed by a claimant in order for him to collect a property which is apparently for someone else. How about if this type of story is given in relation to Abubakar as-Siddiq?

The hadith he mentioned stating that: "All of them have recorded it," is not found in all books of hadith and none of the scholars of hadith narrated it. Um 'Aiman is the mother of Usama bin Zaid, she is the nurse maid of the Prophet (s.a.w) and among the Muhajirun. She has rights and command respect; but narrating from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) shall not be by lying against him and against scholars. When one say: "they have all narrated it," it shall only be with regard to concurrent hadith and whoever made such statement is one of the most ignorant men, and whoever rejected the hadith: "We are not inherited," which has been narrated by grand companions is one of the most obstinate, pigheaded men in rejecting the truth.

Fifthly: The Rafidi stated: "Ali (r.a) gave testimony for her but he rejected it because he is her husband." We reply: This statement although it is a lie, but even if it is sound it is not a cause for censure or disparagement. This is because testimony of a man for his wife is rejected by most of the scholars and those who accepted it does so with the condition that it is supported by another man or with two women. Giving judgment with the attestation of a man and a woman is not allowed except if the claimant is made to swear an oath.

Sixthly: The Rafidi stated: "They all narrated it that the Prophet said: 'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with him, it follows him wherever he go and they will not separate until they meet me at the cistern.'"

We reply: This is a great lie and a show of extreme ignorance. This hadith has never been narrated by anybody neither with a sound chain of narrators nor with a weak chain of authority. Then how can anybody say: "They all narrated this hadith!" Who lied more than the person who said that all the companions and scholars have narrated

a hadith and that hadith is absolutely not known to emanate from any one of them!!

In contrast to what he said about Um 'Aiman that she is in Paradise, for it is possible the Prophet (s.a.w) has said that because she is a virtuous woman among those who immigrated from Makka to Madina thus, information about that she is in Paradise cannot be denied. With regard to what he said concerning one of the companions that he is with the truth and the truth is with him wherever he goes and that they will not separate until they meet the Prophet (s.a.w) at the cistern; this type of statement is absolved from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), because those who go to the cistern are men and not abstract ideas as the Messenger of Allah said to the Ansar: ***“You will surely come across preferential treatment after me, so you should be patient until you meet me at the cistern (Haud-i-Kauthar)” (Muslim).*** In another hadith he said: ***“When Allah grants wealth to any one of you, he should first spend it on himself and his family (and then give it in charity to the poor. I heard him (also) say: I will be your forerunner at the cistern (expecting your arrival)” (Muslim).***

Seventhly: What the Rafidi mentioned with regard to Fatima (r.a) does not suite her status and nobody argue that way but an ignorant person thinking that he is praising her while in reality he is disparaging her, for there is nothing in what Abubakar mentioned that will make her to be angry with him, because he only judged – if the occurrence is true – with the truth which no Muslim shall give a verdict except with it. Whoever requested that judgment shall be made in contradiction to the laws of Allah and His Messenger, (and when the truth contradicted his wish) he became angry and swore never to speak to the judge or his companion again; such a conduct shall not be praised or commended for him and the judge shall not be censured for that. Any conduct that contradicted the laws of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) deserves censure and disparagement and not commendation. We knew that what is being narrated about Fatima and other companions of detestable acts are mostly lies and in some of it they are using their sincere effort to do the right thing

even if they erred. If they commit some sins, those people are not infallible, nay although they are friends of Allah and of the denizens of Paradise; they have some sins which Allah will forgive them.

What he also mentioned that Fatima left a will authorizing that she shall be buried in the night and that none of them shall pray over her dead body cannot be stated to have emanate from her and nobody argue with it except the ignorant person who is ascribing to her what does not suite her status.^[90] If such statement is sound it is more suited to be a forgiven sin than a commendable act; this is because if a Muslim prayed over another Muslim that is an increment of good work that will reach him and the best of people cannot be harmed because the most evil of men has supplicated for him. This is the Prophet (s.a.w); good people as well as bad people and hypocrites are supplicating for him and if their supplications did not benefit him, they cannot harm him. The Prophet (s.a.w) knew that there are hypocrites (and evil men) in his community but he did not prevent anyone from his community from supplicating for him.

The Rafidi stated that: "They all narrated the Prophet's words: 'O Fatima, surely Allah is angry with your anger and is please with what you are pleased.'"

We reply: This is a lie from this Rafidi for nobody narrated such a hadith from the Prophet (s.a.w) and it is not known in any of the known books of hadiths, it hasn't got any known chain of authority from the Prophet (s.a.w) neither a sound one nor a good one.

We (Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah) attest that Fatima (r.a) is in Paradise, and that Allah is pleased with her. We also attest that Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Talha, Zubair, Sa'id, and Abdurrahman bin 'Auf are also in Paradise. We bear testimony that Allah has informed that He is pleased with them in many places in His Book, such as: **"And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun (those who migrated from Makkah to Al-Madinah) and the Ansar (the citizens of Al-Madinah who helped and gave aid to the Muhajirun) and also those who followed them exactly (in Faith). Allah is well-pleased with them as they are well-pleased with**

Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow (Paradise), to dwell therein forever. That is the supreme success” (9:100). And in another place He said: “Indeed, Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave their Bai'a (pledge) to you (O Muhammad SAW) under the tree, He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down As-Sakinah (calmness and tranquility) upon them, and He rewarded them with a near victory” (48:18). It has been established that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) dies while he is pleased with them and whoever Allah is pleased with will not be harmed by the anger and displeasure of anybody (whoever he is).

With regard to his words: “They all narrated that the Prophet said: ‘Fatima is part of me, whoever harms her harm me and whoever harms me has harmed Allah.’”

We reply: This hadith has not been narrated with that expression but it was narrated with another wording in the context of the hadith that mentioned request of Ali to marry the daughter of Abu Jahal when the Prophet stood and stated: ***“Surely Bani Hisham bin Mughira have sought for my permission to marry their daughter to Ali bin Abi Talib and I do not permit that, I do not permit it and do not permit it, for Fatima is part of me whatever makes her suspicion also makes me suspicious and whatever harms her also harms me, except if Ibn Abu Talib want to divorce my daughter and wed their daughter” (Bukhari).***

Eighthly: The Rafidi said: “If that narration is truly sound he would not have left the mule, the sword and the turban with Ali and he gave verdict in his favor when Abbas claimed it.”

We reply: Whoever narrated that Abubakar and Umar has given those properties to anyone or left those properties with anyone as his possession has told a very clear lie against them. The only thing that can be done in such a situation is to leave the properties in the custody of someone the way they are left in the custody of Ali and Abbas under the condition that they manage and spend them as directed by the law.^{[\[91\]](#)}

With regard to his words: “That would have entailed that the family of the Prophet (s.a.w) who Allah has cleansed in His Book have committed some wrong.”

We reply to him: Surely Allah did not stated in His Book that He has cleansed all people of the Prophet’s family and has removed from them abomination; this is a clear lie against Allah. How can that be when we knew that among Bani Hashim there those who are not protected from committing sins and He did not take away from them abomination – and this is the belief of Shia Rafida – for according to them whoever among the Bani Hashim loves Abubakar and Umar is not cleansed. What the verse stated is: “... **Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification**” (33:33). We have mentioned that this just His words: “... **Allah does not want to place you in difficulty, but He wants to purify you, and to complete His Favor on you that you may be thankful**” (5:6). And His words: “**Allah wishes to make clear (what is lawful and what is unlawful) to you, and to show you the ways of those before you, and accept your repentance, and Allah is AllKnower, AllWise**” (4:26). And there are other similar verses which means that Allah loves that for you, He is pleased with that and He is commanding you to that (so that you are cleansed) and thus, whoever does what he is commanded will attain the intended; the love and pleasure of Allah and whoever does not do what he is commanded will not attain that.

With regard to his words: “Because taking charity is forbidden for them.”

We reply to him: Firstly: What is forbidden for them to take is the compulsory charity (Zakat), with regard to voluntary charity, it is well known that they have been drinking from the water dedicated to charity between Makka and Madina and they have been stating: ‘Only Zakat is forbidden for us to take but voluntary charity is not forbidden to us.’ Thus, if it right for them to benefit from the charities of people not related to them, then it is more suited for them to

benefit from the charity of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Those properties are not Zakat which Allah obligated upon the Prophet (s.aw), which are people's dirt; nay they are war booties which Allah gave to the His Prophet (s.a.w) and it is permitted for them (to consume it). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) made what Allah has given him of booty as dedicated charity for His purpose is that it shall belong to the Prophet (s.a.w) and it shall be distributed to needy Muslims as charity; his family more deserved his charity, for giving charity to Muslims is a charity while giving charity to kindred and close relatives is both charity and strengthening the bond of kinship.

Eighthly: With regard to his objection of the hadith of Jabir bin Abdullah al-Ansari, we say: Jabir did not claim a right against someone which shall be collected and be given to him, but he rather requested for something from the public treasury which a ruler is allowed to give to him even if the Prophet (s.a.w) did not promise him and if he has promised him; it is only right and more suitable that the promise shall be fulfilled; for these reasons there is no need for a witness.

With regard to the story of Fatima: What they claimed that it is a gift given to her by the Prophet (s.a.w) and the attestation that has been cited and related issues that they mentioned as arguments; if they are sound they are closer to disparagements than commendations.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON SIDDIQ (TESTIFIER TO THE TRUTH) AND WHY HE WAS GIVEN THE TITLE

The Rafidi stated: “It has been narrated from all of them that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘The earth has never carried and the sky has never given cover to a person whose statements are more truthful than that of Abu Dhar.’ But they never called him Siddiq (testifier to the truth) and they gave Abubakar that title although the Prophet (s.a.w) did not mention similar commendation regarding him.”

We reply: This hadith has not been narrated by all of them, it is not in the books of Bukhari and Muslim, it is also not in the books of Sunnan hadith compendiums, nay it is just narrated. If we assume that it is a sound hadith, we all know that it does not mean that Abu Dhar is the most truthful person for that will entail that he is more truthful than the Prophet (s.a.w), all other Prophets (a.s) and more than Ali bin Abi Talib, and such statement has contradicted the consensus of all Muslims; both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. Thus, it is clear that the expression means that Abu Dhar is a truthful person and that other than him do not investigate the truth more than him. If he is like other person in searching for the truth, it does not entail that he reached his degree in telling the truth, attesting to the truth and honoring the truth that he told, attest to and believed in it. We can say: So and so is truthful in expression and that he searches for the truth even if he has little knowledge of what Prophets have brought. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) did not say: “The earth has not carried someone who testifies to the truth greater than Abu Dhar,” but he said: **“More truthful in expression.”**

Thus the commendations for Abubakar as-Siddiq (r.a) is not just because he is truthful in expression but also because he accepted the truth, testify to it and believe whatever the Prophets (a.s) brought. His testifying to whatever the Prophet (s.a.w) brought is a special truthfulness and faithfulness, thus commendation with this type of special truthfulness is a category of being truthful and commendation with that his expressions are always the truth is another category of being truthful. Every Siddiq (a person who

always accepted whatever the Prophet brought) is truthful and not every truthful person is a Siddiq. [\[92\]](#)

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON CALLING ABUBAKAR SUCCESSOR OF THE PROPHET

The Rafidi stated: “They named him the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he neither appoint him in his life nor after his death and they did not name Ali bin Abi Talib as successor to the Prophet (s.a.w) although he has appointed him in many places among which are his appointment to oversee Madina when he went for Tabuk campaign and he said to him: ‘Surely Madina will not be good except with me or you; are you not pleased to be unto me as Aaron (a.s) is unto Moses (a.s), excepting that there are is no Prophet after me.’ He appointed Usama bin Zaid (r.a) over an army which included Abubakar and Umar in its ranks; he died without removing him, but they did not call him as his successor. When Abubakar became the man in charge with authority, Usama became angry and said: ‘The Prophet has made me your leader, and thus, who has appointed you as my leader?’ Abubakar and Umar went to him begging him until he was conciliated and thereafter, they used to call him leader throughout his life.”

The answers to the above contentions are from many perspectives:

Firstly: Meaning of a successor is either the one who succeeded another person, even if he did not appoint him, as is generally known linguistically and this is what most scholars said or its meaning could be the one who is appointed by the outgoing leader (to succeed him), and this is the opinion of a group of Zahiriyah school of jurisprudence scholars and the Shia etcetera. If we mean by a successor the former definition; then Abubakar is the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w), because he is the one who succeeded him after his death and nobody succeeded the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) after his death other than Abubakar. Thus, he is necessarily, unavoidably and absolutely the successor (of the Prophet) to the exclusion of all other people; even Shia and other groups are not challenging the fact that he is the one who exercise power and authority after him (s.a.w) and thus, he is his successor; leading the Muslims in prayers, executing laws among them, share and manage

the state treasury among them, command them in fighting the enemies, appoint over them governors and leaders and discharge and carry out other duties that are performed by the ruler and the commander in chief.

The responsibilities of the supreme leader and the commander in chief were shouldered by Abubakar after the death of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and this has been agreed upon by all people (including the opponents) and therefore, he is absolutely the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w). The opinion of Ahlus Sunnah is that he succeeded him and he more deserved to succeed him, while Shia (the moderate among them such as Zaidiyyah) are saying: Ali more deserved to succeed him but the successorship of Abubakar is sound, and they are saying: It is not right for him to be the successor, but they are not disputing that he has actually become the successor and thus, he deserved that title because he is the one who succeeded (or come after) another person by all measures and considerations.

If it said that a successor is the one who somebody appointed to succeed him (take over his position), and this also is the opinion of some Ahlus Sunnah and some Shia (the extremists among them such as Rafida): Those who made this statement among Ahlus Sunnah are saying; surely the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed Abubakar either by an explicit unambiguous text- as opined by some of them – or by latent texts (those that need interpretation). Shia that are claiming textual appointment of Ali are also divided into two: There are those who are claiming explicit texts for Ali, and this is the opinion of Shia Imamiyyah. The second group amongst them is saying that Imam Ali was appointed by latent texts and this is the opinion of Shia Jarudiyyah (Houthiyyah), a faction of Shia Zaidiyyah.

Those who are claiming explicit texts or latent texts with regard to the Caliphate of Abubakar have stronger and clearer proofs than those who are claiming textual appointment of Ali. There are many texts establishing the successorship of Abubakar, but with regard to

Ali nothing is brought forward to prove his successorship except that it is found to be a lie or that there is no evidence in it.

In these respects, nobody succeeded the Prophet (s.a.w) after his death other than Abubakar and that is why he is the successor of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Generally a successor is the one who came after the incumbent has died (or left the position for any reason), or the incumbent appointed him to succeed him; both descriptions are applicable to Abubakar and that is why he is the (successor of the Messenger of Allah).

With regard to the appointment of Ali (r.a) over Madina; know that is not exclusive to him for it is the custom of the Prophet (s.a.w) whenever he left Madina for a campaign he would appoint one of his companions to oversee it, in the like manner he appointed Ibn Umm Makhtoum (during the Battle of the Ditch) and he appointed Uthman bin Affan (during the campaign of Dhat ar-Riq'a). Thus he has appointed other than Ali in better positions and more than he appointed him and his appointment over Madina is a restricted successorship over a given population, during his absence and thus, it is not the general successorship after his death over his community. None of those who the Prophet (s.a.w) gave appointment (to oversee Madina etc.) is called a successor of the Prophet (s.a.w) except with restriction and qualification and if Ali is given that title, then other than him among the companions who were given such restricted appointments deserved that title more than him: such appointment has never been exclusive to him.

Furthermore, the one who succeed the incumbent leader after his death shall be the best among them, in contrast to the one who succeeded him when he went out to fight his enemy who shall not be the best among people. Nay, traditionally when a leader is going out for war, he will go with his best men; who are better than the one he will leave at home to take care of his family; this is because the one that is beneficial in the fight is his associate in what he is doing, and thus, he is greater than the one he left to take care of his family for

you cannot compare the benefits of Jihad with the benefits of staying at home.^[93]

The Prophet (s.a.w) made Ali similar to Aaron (a.s) on the basis of successorship (overseeing) and not on the basis of its perfection and completeness and Imam Ali has associates in that type of successorship. This is explained by the fact that when Moses (a.s) went to attend the appointment of His Lord, he went alone; nobody goes with him and he appointed Aaron (a.s) to oversee all his nation, in contrast to the Prophet (s.a.w) for he went out for the war with all his nation except those who have some excuses and thus, he was not made a successor but over women, children and very few men (including the old and the sick). Therefore, his successorship has not been like that of Moses (a.s) to Aaron (a.s). Nay, he only gave him some trusts during his absence as Moses (a.s) gave Aaron (a.s) some trusts during his absence. Thus, the Prophet (s.a.w) explained to Ali (r.a) – after his objection – that appointing him to oversee Madina is not due to a decreased status of the person appointed, but that could be due to his trust worthiness, just as Prophet Moses (a.s) appointed Prophet Aaron (a.s) to succeed him over his nation. (it was reported that) Imam Ali (r.a) went out to the Prophet crying and saying: ***“Are you leaving me with women and children?” As if he hated to stay back at home (instead of participating in Jihad with the Prophet).***

With regard to the Rafidi’s statement: “He said to him: ‘Madina will not be good except with me or with you.’”

We reply: This is a lie against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); it is unknown in any reliable book of knowledge. Among the things that showed that it is a lie is the fact that the Prophet (s.a.w) has left Madina uncountable time in the company of Ali and during those periods neither he nor Ali is in it. Therefore, how can anybody say: Madina will not be good except with me or with you?

With regard to his words: “He appointed Usama bin Zaid over an army which included Abubakar and Umar.”

We reply that: This is a lie that is clear and known to whoever has limited knowledge of hadith for surely Abubakar is not in that army. Nay, the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed him to succeed him in leading prayers when he is terminally ill. It was reported that he gave the flag to Usama before he fell sick and when he became sick he commanded Abubakar to lead people in prayers and he continued praying with them up to the time he died. If we assumed that he was commanded to be part of Usama's army before he fell sick; then the command given to him to lead people in prayers during that period, in addition to the permission he gave Usama to advance towards the enemies while he was sick has abrogated and nullified the leadership of Usama over him. Then how about when Usama was never appointed over him as a leader?

His words: "He died without removing him." We said: It is Abubakar who dispatched the army of Usama after people have advised him to bring it back due to the fear of the enemies. He said: ***"I swear by Allah, I will not bring down a flag that has been raised by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w),"*** although he has the power to remove him, the same way the Prophet can remove him because he is now standing in his position and he can do what he judged is the best for the Muslims.

What he mentioned about the anger of Usama when Abubakar became the Caliph are nothing but ugly lies, for the love of Usama to Abubakar and his obedience to him are undeniably known facts. He is the furthest of men from dissention and disunity, for he refused to fight during the civil war, neither on the side of Ali nor on the side of Mu'awiyah; he shunned, abandoned and stayed away from the tribulation. Usama is not from the Quraish and he is not of those who deserved to become Caliphs and the thought of taking over (by force) will never occur to his mind. Therefore, what benefit will return to him for making such statements against whoever became the Caliph, while he knew that whoever attains the supreme authority is his leader and commander? If we assumed that the Prophet (s.a.w) has made him leader over Abubakar and after that he died, naturally by his death authority is vested in the hand of whoever succeeded

him and that person has the power of commanding the army to march on or stop and allowing Usama to lead the army or remove him. If he said: He made me a leader over you, then who made you the Caliph? He will reply him: The one who made leader over all the Muslims and over those who are better than you. And if he said: As for me he has made me leader over you. He will reply: He made you a leader over me before I became the supreme commander (Caliph) and after I have become the leader, I have automatically become your leader and commander. This type of fact can only be denied by the ignorant and Usama is more pious, more rational and more knowledgeable from making these types of flimsy, irrational statements to Abubakar.

What surprises one the most is what those liars stated: "He and Umar went to him and begged him until they conciliated him," although they are saying: They (Abubakar and Umar) have suppressed Ali, Bani Hashim and Bani Abdu Munaf and they did not sought their cooperation or conciliation, while they are greater, stronger, more numerous and respected than Usama. Those people who the Shia are saying have suppressed Bani Hashim, Bani Umayyah and all Bani Abdul Munaf, all the clans of Quraish, all the Ansar and all the Arab tribes; what need will they have for going to beg Usama bin Zaid and try to make him be pleased with them while he is the weakest of their subjects; he does not have a tribe nor a clan, he has neither men nor money and if not of the Prophet's (s.a.w) love for him and his giving him appointment he would not be more than the other weak men of the community.

If you say: "They sought to conciliate him because the Prophet (s.a.w) loved him!!!" We reply that: But you people are saying: They changed his (the Prophet's) will, committed injustice against his (appointed) legate (Ali) and took away his rights. Then whoever disobeyed sound directives, change clear will, committed injustice, transgression, aggression and did not turn to obedience to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and he neither regard the ties of kinship nor that of covenant in dealing with the family of Muhammad; how can such a person consider the like of Usama bin Zaid and conciliate

him? This is a man – in accordance to Shia claims - who rejected the testimony of Um 'Aiman and he did not conciliate her, angered Fatima and harmed her while she more deserved to be conciliated. Whoever can do all these things, what need will he have to conciliate Usama? People are conciliated either for religious purpose or for worldly benefits; so if they do not have religion faith that will cause them to conciliate those whose conciliation is necessary and they do not need him for any worldly benefit; then what will urge them to conciliate with him? Shia Rafida, due to their ignorance and lies are contradicting themselves too much and very clear contradictions. This is because they are in doctrinal discordant; through which are deluded (away from the Truth) such as would be deluded.

SEGMENT: ON NAMING UMAR AS FARUQ (ONE WHO DISTINGUISH THE TRUTH FROM FASLHOOD)

The Rafidi stated: "And they named Umar (r.a) as Faruq and they did not name Ali (r.a) with that title, although the Prophet has said concerning him: 'This is the Faruq of my community, he distinguish the truth from falsehood.' Ibn Umar said: 'We have no means of identifying the hypocrites during the time of the Prophet except through their hatred of Ali.'"

We reply: Firstly: All those who have knowledge of hadith will have no doubt that those two hadiths are fabricated lies against Allah and His Messenger; none of them has been recorded in reliable books and none of them has any none reliable chain of authority.

Secondly: Whoever attests with a hadith on issues relating to branches of religion must mention its chain of authority. Then what about a person who is attesting on issue relating to principles of religion? Otherwise just stating: "The Prophet said," by a speaker is not a proof by the consensus of men of knowledge and if it is evidence, then each hadith that one of the Ahlus Sunnah says: "The Prophet said," would have been a proof and evidence. We will be satisfied and convinced on this issue if he can relate to us a hadith with its chain of authority of men who are known to be reliable and truthful from any sect they belong. But if the hadith has no chain of authority and this man copied it, and he did not reject it but he copied it from the book of another person and that copyist do not know from who he copied it, and we knew that a lot of lies have been made on this and other issues. Then can it be right for anybody to ascribe to the Prophet (s.a.w) a statement which chain of authority is not known!!

Thirdly: It is well known by whoever has experience that the scholars are the greatest people that researches and seeks the words of the Prophet (s.a.w) in order to acquire its knowledge, they are the people who desire to follow it and act upon it the most, and they are the furthest people from following vain desires that contradicted it. If

they found any sound knowledge that the Prophet (s.a.w) said that to Ali, they would have been the first people among all people to follow his words; for surely they follow his words, because they believed in him and loved to follow his directives not because they have any personal goal or benefit they want to get from the person who has been commended. If they have confirmed that the Prophet (s.a.w) has said to Ali: “This is the Faruq of my community,” they would have accepted it, in the same way that they narrated his words concerning Abu Ubaidah: **“This is the trustee of this community” (Bukhari).** And he said to Zubair: **“Behold for every Prophet there is a helper and my helper is Zubair” (Bukhari, Muslim).** They also accepted and reported his words concerning Ali: **“Surely, I will give the flag tomorrow to a man who loved Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger loves him” (Bukhari, Muslim).** They also reported the hadith of the garment when he said to Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain: **“O Allah! Those are members of my family, remove from them abomination and cleanse them a perfect cleansing” (Muslim).** There are many other hadiths (where the Prophet spoke about the virtues of his companions and members of his family that have been related by scholars).

Fourthly: All those two hadiths are known by proofs to be lies and fabricated and thus ascribing them to the Prophet (s.a.w) is prohibited. We ask: What does it mean that Ali or someone else is the Faruq of this community who distinguish between truth and falsehood? If it is meant by that he distinguishes between the people of truth and the people of falsehood; by that he distinguish between believers and hypocrites; then this is a thing that nobody can be able to do among mankind, neither a Prophet nor anyone else. Allah the Most High has said: **“And among the Bedouins round about you, some are hypocrites, and so are some among the people of Madina, they exaggerate and persist in hypocrisy, you (O Muhammad) know them not, We know them. We shall punish them twice, and thereafter they shall be brought back to a great (horrible) torment” (9:101).** So if the Prophet (s.a.w) did not know

each particular hypocrite in Madina and its surroundings; then how can anyone else have that knowledge?

The love Shia Rafida are showing to Imam Ali is false, this is because they love what does not exist; that is an infallible Imam that has been textually appointed who succeeded the Prophet (s.a.w) immediately after his death and who believe that Abubakar and Umar are unbelievers, oppressors and aggressors. If it became clear to them on the Day of Judgment that he is not the best of any of those men and that the utmost extent he can reach is to be close to one of them; that he has accepted their leadership, that he has not been textually appointed as (immediate leader after the Prophet); at that moment it will be very clear to them that they have not been loving Ali (r.a). Nay, in fact, truth and reality, they are the greatest of all people who hated him. They surely hated Ali who has been described with the characteristics and traits upon which Ali was and which perfectly suited him more than anyone else; such as affirming the Caliphate of the first three Caliphs and their precedence and preference, for he surely used to uphold their leadership and their virtues. It is thus clear that he (the Rafidi) absolutely hated Ali (because he hated what Ali love).

Thus, it is clear that the hadith that has been recorded by Muslim in his sound collection of hadith in which Imam Ali said: ***“By Him Who split up the seed and created something living, the Apostle (may peace and blessings be upon him) gave me a promise that no one but a believer would love me, and none but a hypocrite would nurse grudge against me” (Muslim).*** If this hadith in truth are the words of the Prophet (s.a.w); then surely Rafidah do not love Ali and what he is upon (of belief and practice). Nay, their love for him is the type of love that Jews displayed for Moses (a.s) and Christians to Jesus (a.s). Nay, Shia Rafidah hated the descriptions and characteristics of Ali, the way Jews and Christians hated the attributes of Moses (a.s) and Jesus (a.s), this is because they hated whoever uphold the Prophethood of Muhammad and they (Moses and Jesus) have upheld it (they foretold it in their Books), – may the peace of Allah be upon all of them.

*** Fifthly: Again, with regard to his claim that Ibn Umar said they used to identify the hypocrites by their hatred of Ali: Everybody who has knowledge know that this is a lie for hypocrisy has many signs. The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“The sign of a hypocrite is the hatred against the Ansar and the sign of a believer is the love for the Ansar” (Muslim)***. In another hadith he said: ***“The love of the Ansar is the sign of faith and hatred against them is the sign of dissemblance” (Muslim)***. He again said: ***“Three are the signs of a hypocrite: when he spoke he told a lie, when he made a promise he acted treacherously against it, when he was trusted he betrayed”*** – (in another version: ***“Three are the signs of a hypocrite, even if he observed fast and prayed and asserted that he was a Muslim” - (Muslim)***). Allah the Most High said in the Qur’an while describing the hypocrites: ***“And of them are some who accuse you (O Muhammad) in the matter of (the distribution of) the alms. If they are given part thereof, they are pleased, but if they are not given thereof, behold! They are enraged!” (9:58)***. And He said: ***“And among them are men who hurt the Prophet (Muhammad) and say: “He is (lending his) ear (to every news).” Say: “He listens to what is best for you; he believes in Allah; has faith in the believers; and is a mercy to those of you who believe.” But those who hurt Allah’s Messenger (Muhammad) will have a painful torment” (9:61)***. And in another verse He said: ***“And among them is he who says: “Grant me leave (to be exempted from Jihad) and put me not into trial.” Surely, they have fallen into trial. And verily, Hell is surrounding the disbelievers” (9:49)***. And again Allah said: ***“And whenever there comes down a Surah (chapter from the Quran), some of them (hypocrites) say: ‘Which of you has had his Faith increased by it?’ As for those who believe, it has increased their Faith, and they rejoice” (9:124)***. Thus, Allah has informed them in Chapter Nine of the Qur’an and in other Chapters the signs and characteristics of hypocrites which this little space cannot contain. If to say he stated: Of the signs of hypocrites is hatred of Ali; he would have made a sound statement, just as it a sign of hypocrites to hate the Ansar. Nay, also showing hatred for Abubakar, Umar and others,

because whoever hates who is known to be loved and befriended by the Prophet (s.a.w) shall know that he has fallen into a branch of hypocrisy; this proof persists and do not diminish. This is why the greatest sects of hypocrites are those who hated Abubakar and Umar, for nobody among the companions is loved by the Prophet (s.a.w) more than him (Abubakar) and nobody among them loved the Prophet (s.a.w) more than him. Therefore, hating him is one of the greatest signs of hypocrisy and that is why you find that the sects that hated him the most are the greatest hypocrites such as Nusairiyyah, Isma'iliyyah (and Rafidah).

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE VIRTUES OF AISHA

The Rafidi stated: “They exalted the issue of Aisha over the rest of his wives although he used to mention Khadija bint Khuwailid too often. Aisha said: ‘You mentioned her too much while Allah has exchanged her with someone who is better than her.’ He replied: ‘By Allah she has not been replaced with someone who is better than her, she gave me abode when people expelled me, she made me comfortable with her wealth and Allah gave me children with her.’”

We reply: Ahlus Sunnah have not reached a consensus with regard to her being the best of his wives, but many of them held that opinion and their proof for that belief are the hadith of Anas bin Malik and Abu Musa (r.a) about the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) when he said: ***“The excellence of Aisha over women is like the excellence of Tharid^[94] over all other foods” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Tharid is the best of foods because it is a mixture of bread and meat. That is because wheat is the best of foods and meat is the best of condiments. A hadith has been narrated by Ibn Qutaibah and others that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“The master of condiments for the people of this world and the Hereafter is meat” (Ibn Majah – and it is a weak hadith).*** It come in sound hadith that ‘Amr bin ‘As said: ***“The Prophet deputed me to lead the Army of Dhat-as-Salasil (battle). I came to him and said, ‘Who is the most beloved person to you?’ He said, ‘Aisha.’ I asked, ‘Among the men?’ He said, ‘Her father.’ I said, ‘Who then?’ He said, ‘Then ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab.’ He then named other men” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

Those people are saying: He said concerning Khadija (r.a); She has not been replaced with someone who is better than her. If it is a sound hadith then it mean: He has not replaced her with someone better for me; this is because Khadija has benefitted him at the first period of Islam in such a way that nobody can be able to take her place and thus she is better for him from this consideration, for she has benefitted him at the time of need. With regard to Aisha (r.a), she accompanied him at the last period of Prophethood and

perfection of religion, she thus attained and acquired knowledge and faith more than the one who has accompanied him at the first period of Islam and thus she is better because of these additional virtues. With this it will be understood that the Islamic community benefitted from Aisha more than with any of his wives. She attained a greater degree in knowledge and acquisition of the Sunnah to the extent that no one else reached her (and she taught that knowledge to the Islamic community). Therefore, the benefits of Khadija is confined to the person of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) for she did not convey any knowledge from him and the Islamic community did not benefitted from her as it benefitted from Aisha; and the religion is not perfected at the beginning of Islam so that she can learn it and attain through that perfection of belief, in such a manner similar to those who believed in it after its completeness and perfection.

*** Whoever concentrates his concern and effort on one thing is better than the one who dispersed his concern on different things. Thus, Khadija is better for him from this consideration, but types of good works are not confined to that. Do not you see that whoever from among the companions who is greater in faith and greater in fighting in the path of Allah with his wealth and his person, such as Hamza, Sa'ad bin Mua'az and Usaid bin Khudair etc. – are better than those who used to serve the Prophet (s.a.w) and benefit him in himself such as Abu Rafi' and Anas bin Malik etc.

Summarily, we are not here to enumerated all the virtues of Aisha and Khadijah, but what we are aiming at is that Ahlus Sunnah have agreed upon exalting Aisha (r.a) and loving her; that she was the most beloved and the most exalted to the Prophet (s.a.w) among his wives, that she is the mothers of believers that outlived him and that she commands the greatest respect among the Muslims. It come in sound hadith that people used to send their gifts on the day when the Prophet (s.a.w) is in the house of Aisha (r.a) seeking thereby the pleasure of the Prophet (s.a.w) because they are aware of his love for her to the extent that the rest of his wives became jealous and send Fatima to him (in order to talk to him on that issue), part of the hadith runs: ***“The wives of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon***

*him) sent Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him), to Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him). She sought permission to get in as he had been lying with me in my mantle. He gave her permission and she said: Allah's Messenger, verily, your wives have sent me to you in order to ask you to observe equity in case of the daughter of Abu Quhafa. She (Aisha) said: I kept quiet. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said to her (Fatima): O daughter, don't you love whom I love? She said: Yes, (I do). Thereupon he said: I love this one. Fatima then stood up as she heard this from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and went to the wives of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) and informed them of what she had said to him and what Allah's messenger (may peace be upon him) had said to her. Thereupon they said to her: 'We think that you have been of no avail to us. You may again go to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and tell him that his wives seek equity in case of the daughter of Abu Quhafa.' Fatima said: 'By Allah, I will never talk to him about this matter (again)...' (Bukhari, Muslim). In another hadith the Prophet (s.a.w) said to her while he is in her house: "O Aisha, this is Angel Gabriel offering you greeting.' She replied: 'May the Peace of Allah and His Mercy be upon him.' And added: 'You see what we do not see'" (Muslim). When he (s.a.w) wanted to divorce Saudah bint Zam'ah she donated her day to Aisha by his permission and during his terminal illness he used to inquire: "**Where I would be tomorrow, where I would be tomorrow (thinking, that the turn of Aisha was not very near),**" and when it was her turn he sought the permission of his wives to nurse his sickness in her house and died in it while he is reclining between her chest and neck.*

Aisha has been a blessing upon the Muslim community to the extent that when the verse of Tayammum (dry ablution) was revealed because of her,^[95] Usaid bin Khudair (r.a) said: "**O the family of Abubakar! This is not the first blessing of yours**" (Bukhari). In another version of the hadith: Usaid bin Hudair said to 'Aisha, "**May**

Allah rewards you. By Allah, whenever anything happened which you did not like, Allah brought good for you and for the Muslims in that” (Bukhari). Allah revealed the verse of her absolvment (from slander) from the seven Heavens and He made it one of the lessons (from which laws and other benefits are deduced).

SEGMENT: REFUTING THEIR ALLEGATIONS AGAINST AISHA, THE MOTHER OF BELIEVERS

The Rafidi stated: “She divulged the secret of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he once said to her: ‘You will certainly fight Ali, while you are unjust to him.’ She also disobeyed the command of Allah, where He said: **‘And remain in your homes and do not display yourselves like the time of ignorance...’ (33:33)**. She went out publicly to fight Ali unjustly; because Muslims have agreed upon killing Uthman and she used to command people at that time saying: ‘Kill the useless old man, may Allah kill him,’ and when she heard that he was killed she became happy and then asked: ‘Who became the Caliph?’ They replied: ‘Ali.’ She then went out to fight him for the blood of Uthman. What is the sin of Ali in connection with that? And how did Talha, Zubair and others obeyed her regarding that mission? With what face will they face the countenance of the Prophet? This, although if one of us talked to the wife of someone, take her away from her house and travelled with her, he is one of his ardent enemies. Then how about when tens of thousands of Muslims have obeyed her on that, then aided her on fighting the Commander of the Believers and none of them aided the daughter of the Prophet (s.a.w) against Abubakar and nobody oppose him with even one word!!!

The reply is that we say: As far as the Ahlus Sunnah are concerned, they are on this issue and other issues; are upholding justice, giving witness for the sake of Allah the Most High and their statements are true and just and therefore, they are not self-contradictory. With regard to Shia Rafida and other sects of innovations; there are a lot of falsehoods and contradictions in their statements which we will explain some of it – by the will of Allah. This is because Ahlus Sunnah believed that all those who participated in the Battle of Badr are denizens of Paradise, so also the Mothers of Believers; Aisha and the rest of them and Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Talha, Zubair are the chief of the people of Paradise after the Prophet (s.a.w). Ahlus Sunnah are also saying: Undoubtedly, it is not a condition for the denizens of Paradise to be free from committing mistakes or sins

and this is agreed upon by all the Muslims; even if they did not repent from it (in this world) for minor sins are forgiven by shunning and avoiding major sins, in accordance to the generality of the Muslim scholars. Nay, according to most of them even major sins might be forgiven due to good, righteous works that are greater than it and by trials with which Allah forgive sins and other means (of expiation of sins).

Since this is their principle, they are saying: What are being mentioned about the companions of wrong doings, are mostly lies. In many of those issues they are Mujtahidun (makers of sincere efforts to arrive at legal decision by independent interpretation of the legal sources, the Qur'an and the Sunnah), but many people did not know the basis of their Ijtihad (their deduced legal decision by independent interpretation of the legal sources, the Qur'an and the Sunnah) and in the area where they erred or commit sin; they are forgiven by Allah, either due to their good works that erase sins or by trials through which Allah remit sins or other factors.

Undoubtedly, there are sound proofs by which necessarily we must say and believe that they are of the denizens of Paradise. And thus they will never commit anything that will lead them to Hell-Fire and if one of them did not die upon what leads to Hell Fire – anything less than that cannot hinder their entitlement to Paradise. We knew by certainty that they are denizens of Paradise; even if we did not know that some particular people are in Paradise, it is not permitted for us to object to their deserving Paradise on the basis of things that we did not know that they necessitate Hell-Fire. Surely, such verdict are not allowed in respect of individual believers whose destiny with regard to entitling entering Paradise is not known; we cannot testify against anyone of them that he is of the denizens of Hell-Fire on the basis of probable, ambiguous issues that did not indicate to that. Thus how can that be permitted in relation to the best of believers, while detailed knowledge of each one of them both outwardly and his heart, his good works and his bad works, and Ijtihads are prohibitive to us. What we say in this regard is that Allah prohibits making statements in what we did not know and speaking without

knowledge. These are the reasons why keeping quiet concerning what has occurred between the Prophet's companions is better than discussing them without real, factual knowledge on the truth and reality about those conditions and occurrences. Surely much of the rush into discussing that – nay most of it – is speaking without knowledge and that is prohibited even if the intention is good and there is no clear intention to oppose a known truth; then how about if the statements are based on vain desires and in opposition to the reality?

*** Narrated Buraydah ibn al-Hasib: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Judges are of three types, one of whom will go to Paradise and two to Hell. The one who will go to Paradise is a man who knows what is right and gives judgment accordingly; but a man who knows what is right and acts tyrannically in his judgment will go to Hell; and a man who gives judgment for people when he is ignorant will go to Hell” (Abu Dawud).*** If this is the case concerning giving judgment between two people on little money or much of it; then how about judging between the Prophet's companion on many issues? Thus, whoever speaks on these issues with ignorance or in contrast to the truth has deserved the threats of Allah and if he speaks the truth with the intention of following his vain desires – not for the sake of Allah the Most High or in order to oppose another truth with it, - such a person also deserved censure and punishment. And whoever knew what the Qur'an and the Sunnah indicated concerning them (the companions) of praises; that Allah is pleased with them, that they deserved Paradise and that they are the best of this nation – which is the best of nations ever raised up for mankind - he will not oppose facts that are certain with ambiguous and unclear issues; some of it nobody knows its soundness, some of it is clear lies, how some of those issues occurred is not known, and the excuses of those people on some of the issues are well known. On some of those issues their repentance is well known and on some of it we knew that they have many good works by which Allah will erase their mistakes. Therefore, whoever follows the path of Ahlus Sunnah his words will be straight and he

will be among the people of truth, the straight path and justice, otherwise he will fall into ignorance, defect, and contradiction like those misguided (Shia).

With regard to his words: “She divulged the secret of the Prophet (s.a.w).” We say: There is no doubt that Allah the Most High said: **“And (remember) when the Prophet (s.a.w) disclosed a matter in confidence to one of his wives (Hafsah), so when she told it (to another i.e. Aisha), and Allah made it known to him, he informed part thereof and left a part. Then when he told her (Hafsah) thereof, she said: ‘Who told you this?’ He said: ‘The All-Knower, the All-Aware (Allah) has told me’” (66:3).** It has been confirmed in Bukhari and Muslim on the authority of Umar (r.a) that they are Aisha and Hafsah.

Firstly, those people (Shia Rafida) rely (sometimes) on verses of the Qur’an in which some clear sins and disobedience that emanated from some of the predecessors are mentioned and then they will interpret them with many different types of interpretations! But Ahlus Sunnah are saying: Nay, those who committed the sin have repented from it and Allah has raised their degrees by that (repentance). This verse is not the only one that showed that some sins have been committed (by the predecessors), so if giving those verses favorable interpretation is right, then giving favorable interpretation to this one is also right and if interpreting them favorably is false, then interpreting those ones favorably is more false.

Secondly, on the consideration that Aisha and Hafsa have committed some sins, there is no doubt that they have regretted from it and this is the apparent meaning of the words of Allah the Most High: **“If you two (wives of the Prophet – s.a.w -, namely Aisha and Hafsah – r.a) turn in repentance to Allah, (it will be better for you), your hearts are indeed so inclined (to oppose what the Prophet likes), but if you help one another against him (Muhammad), then verily, Allah is his Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.), and Jibrael (Gabriel), and the righteous among the believers, and furthermore, the angels are his helpers” (66:4).** Thus, Allah has invited them to repent and we cannot think that they

did not repent due to what has been confirmed of their high degrees; that they are the wives of our Prophet (s.a.w) in Paradise; that Allah has given them choice between the life of this world, and its embellishments and Allah, His Messenger and the Home of the Hereafter and they choose Allah, His Messenger (s.a.w) and the Home of the Hereafter and this is why Allah prohibited him to change any of them and forbids him to marry more wives on them – although scholars have differed on allowing him to do so after that – and he died leaving them as his wives; Mothers of Believers by the testimony of Qur'an. We have already mentioned that sins are forgiven by repentance, good works erases bad works and Allah forgives sins through tests and tribulations.

Thirdly, what has been mentioned about his wives is like what has been mentioned about those who have been testified that they are of the denizens of Paradise among his family and his companions. When Ali (r.a) courted the daughter of Abu Jahal and sought to marry her, the Prophet (s.a.w) stood up and delivered a sermon saying: ***“The sons of Hisham bin Mughira have asked my permission to marry their daughter with 'Ali b. Abi Talib (that refers to the daughter of Abu Jahl for whom Ali had sent a proposal for marriage). But I would not allow them, I would not allow them, I would not allow them (and the only alternative possible is) that Ali should divorce my daughter (and then marry their daughter), for my daughter is part of me. He who disturbs her in fact disturbs me and he who offends her offends me” (Muslim).***^[96] One shall not think that Ali (r.a) abandoned the courtship only outwardly; nay he abandoned it in his heart and repented from the depth of his bosom on that which he intended and sought (of marrying the daughter of Abu Jahal – an enemy of the Messenger of Allah).

*** Also when the Prophet (s.a.w) made peace with the polytheists of Makka on the day of Hudabiyyah, it come in a sound hadith: ***“When the writing of the peace treaty was concluded, Allah's Apostle said to his companions, ‘Get up and’ slaughter your sacrifices and get your head shaved.’ By Allah none of them got up, and***

the Prophet repeated his order thrice. When none of them got up, he left them and went to Um Salama and told her of the people's attitudes towards him. Um Salama said, 'O the Prophet of Allah! Do you want your order to be carried out? Go out and do not say a word to anybody till you have slaughtered your sacrifice and call your barber to shave your head.' So, the Prophet went out and did not talk to anyone of them till he did that, i.e. slaughtered the sacrifice and called his barber who shaved his head. Seeing that, the companions of the Prophet got up, slaughtered their sacrifices, and started shaving the heads of one another, and there was so much rush that there was a danger of killing each other..." (Bukhari). The Prophet (s.a.w) also called upon Ali to delete his title from the document of peace treaty of Hudaibiyyah, but he refused as reported in sound traditions among which is:

Narrated Al-Bara bin 'Azib: "When Allah's Apostle concluded a peace treaty with the people of Hudaibiya, Ali bin Abu Talib wrote the document and he mentioned in it, 'Muhammad, Allah's Apostle.' The pagans said, 'Don't write: 'Muhammad, Allah's Apostle', for if you were an apostle we would not fight with you.' Allah's Apostle asked Ali to rub it out, but Ali said, 'I will not be the person to rub it out.' Allah's Apostle rubbed it out and made peace with them on the condition that the Prophet and his companions would enter Mecca and stay there for three days, and that they would enter with their weapons in cases (Bukhari). It is well-known that the delay of Ali and the other companions from executing his commands to the extent that he become angry – if somebody say that this is a sin! The reply to him will be similar to the reply given to those who said, Aisha has committed sin on what she has done. There are among the scholars those who are giving interpretation to the actions of the companions saying: They delayed based on interpretation, hoping that the situation will change and they will enter Makka. Other scholars says: If they have any acceptable interpretation the Prophet (s.a.w) will not have become angry. Nay, they have repented from that delay and

retracted their steps. Certainly, good deeds will remove this kind of sin and Ali is among them. May Allah be pleased with all of them.

With regard that the Rafidi mentioned that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: "You will fight Ali while you are unto him unjust."

We reply: This hadith is not known in any reliable book of knowledge, it does not have any known chain of authority and thus, it is closer to fabricated lies. Nay, it is absolutely a lie, for Aisha did not fight (Ali), and she did not travel in order to fight (Ali), but she travelled with the intention of rectifying the affairs of Muslims and she thought that her intervention will benefit the Muslims and later on she found out that abandoning the intervention is better to the extent that whenever she remembered that involvement she will weep until her veil became wet with tears.

*** This is how all the predecessors regretted their participation in fighting: Talha, Zubair and Ali all regretted; on the day of the battle of Camel none of them has intention of fighting, it occurred without their choice.

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: "She disobeyed the command of Allah the Most High where He said: **'And remain in your homes and do not display yourselves like the time of ignorance...'**" (33:33).

We reply: Firstly: She did not display her herself like the time of ignorance and the command to remain at home does not prevent them from going out for any allowed benefit, such as going out for major pilgrimage or minor pilgrimage or travelling with her husband in some of his journeys. This verse was revealed during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he used to travel with them after its revelation and he travelled with Aisha and some of his wives during the farewell pilgrimage. The Prophet also send Aisha with her junior brother Abdurrahman, who place her behind him on a camel and she took the intention of performing lesser pilgrimage from a place called Tan'im. Narrated Aisha: ***"That she said, 'O Allah's Apostle! Your companions are returning with the reward of both Hajj and 'Umra, while I am returning with (the reward of) Hajj only.' He said to her, 'Go, and let 'Abdurrahman (i.e. your brother) make***

you sit behind him (on the animal).’ So, he ordered ‘Abdurrahman to let her perform ‘Umra from Al-Tan’im. Then the Prophet waited for her at the higher region of Mecca till she returned” (Bukhari).

*** Farewell pilgrimage took place before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) with less than three months after the revelation of this verse; for these reasons, his wives used to go for the pilgrimage. And during the Caliphate of Umar (r.a) whenever they decided to go for the pilgrimage he used to send either Uthman or Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf to go with them and take care of their caravan. Since their travels and going out of their homes for benefits is allowed Aisha believed that her travel (to Iraq) will benefit the Muslims and she based her action on this interpretation. This is like the words of Allah the Most High: **“O you who believe! Eat not up your property among yourselves unjustly...” (4:29)** And the words of Allah the Exalted: **“... And do not kill yourselves (nor kill one another)...” (4:29)**. This encompasses the slaying of Muslims by each other, and the like the words of Allah the Most Sublime: **“... Nor defame one another...” (49:11)**. And the words of Allah: **“Why then, did not the believers, men and women, when you heard it (the slander) think good of their own people and say: ‘This (charge) is an obvious lie?’ (24:12)**. The Prophet (s.a.w) also said: **“No doubt! Your blood, your properties, and your honor are sacred to one another like the sanctity of this day of yours, in this (sacred) town (Mecca) of yours, in this month of yours.’ The Prophet repeated his statement repeatedly. After that, he raised his head and said, ‘O Allah! Haven’t I conveyed (Your Message) to them’. Haven’t I conveyed Your Message to them?’ Ibn Abbas added, ‘By Him in Whose Hand my soul is, the following was his will (Prophet’s will) to his followers:--It is incumbent upon those who are present to convey this information to those who are absent Beware don’t renegade (as) disbelievers (turn into infidels) after me, Striking the necks (cutting the throats) of one another” (Bukhari)**. The prophet (s.a.w) also said: **“When two Muslims confront one another with swords (in hands) both the**

slayer and the slain would be in Fire. He (Ahnaf) said: I said, or it was said: Allah's Messenger, it may be the case of one who kills. But what about the slain (why he would be put in Hell-Fire)? Thereupon he said: He also intended to kill his companion" (Muslim).

Now, if somebody say; certainly, Ali and those who fought him, have met with their swords and both parties have shed the blood of the Muslims and the threats shall necessarily encompass them. It will be replied to him that; certainly the threats does not encompasses the Mujtahid who made some interpretations even if he erred in his Ijtihad, for Allah has said concerning the blood of believers: "... **Our Lord! Punish us not if we forget or fall into error...**" (2:286). In a hadith al-Qudsi Allah responds to the above prayer with: "**I have certainly granted (the prayer)**" (Muslim). Certainly, Allah the Most High has forgiven upon believers, forgetfulness and mistakes, and the mistakes of a Mujtahid are also forgiven. Therefore, if Allah has forgiven the mistakes of those people in fighting believers; forgiving Aisha – for not remaining in her home, if she is a mujtahidah – is more deserved.

Furthermore, if somebody say: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: "**Madina is like the blacksmith's furnace. It removes the impurities and purifies the good**" (Muwatta). In another hadith he said: "**No one leaves Madina preferring to live elsewhere, but that Allah will give it better than him in place of him**" (Muwatta). Certainly, Ali has left the city, he did not remain in it as was done by the Caliphs before him, and that is why the Muslims did not unite under him.

The reply to the above contention will be that: A Mujtahid who is lesser (by far) than Ali cannot be encompassed by the threats and warnings, and therefore, he is foremost and more deserved that the warning and threats will not encompass him for his Ijtihad. With this, we reply to Aisha's travel – may Allah be pleased with her. If a Mujtahid made mistake his mistake is forgiven in accordance to the texts of Qur'an and Sunnah.

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: "She went out publicly in order to fight Ali unjustly."

We reply: This is a lie against her for she did not go out with the intention of fighting anybody; neither she nor Talha and Zubair intended fighting Ali, and if we assume that they went out to fight him, then that is the fighting mentioned by Allah in His words: **“And if two parties or groups among the believers fall to fighting, then make peace between them both, but if one of them rebels against the other, then fight you (all) against the one that which rebels till it complies with the Command of Allah; then if it complies, then make reconciliation between them justly, and be equitable. Verily! Allah loves those who are equitable. The believers are nothing else than brothers (in Islamic religion). So make reconciliation between your brothers, and fear Allah, that you may receive mercy” (49:9-10).** Thus Allah made them believers though they have fought each other; if this is true with regard those who are lesser than the companions; then they are more deserved to it.

With regard to his words: “Muslims agreed on killing Uthman.”

We say: Firstly: This is a very clear lie because the generality of the Muslims did not command his murder, they did not participate and they are not pleased with it:

1. Most of the Muslims are not in Madina, nay they are in Makka, Yemen, Syria, Kufa, Basrah, Egypt, Khorasan etc. and the people of Madina are some of the Muslims.
2. The best Muslims (all the companions) did not participate in the murder of Uthman; they did not fight him and they did not command anyone to fight him. Those who fought him and killed him are a group of mischief-makers in the earth; the vilest people from different tribes and men of dissent. Imam Ali used to swear all the time: “I surely did not kill Uthman and did not incite anybody to kill him.” He also said: “O Allah curse the murderers of Uthman in the earth and in the sea and in the valleys and on the mountains.”^[97] The extreme statement that could be made is that they did not aid him very well and that a kind of negligence and abandonment took place which gave those corrupt people the opportunity to do what they have done; and they have excuses in that regard^[98] and they never

thought that the matter will reach that extent and if they knew they would have taken necessary action to quash the rebels.

Secondly, those Shia Rafida are showing extreme contradiction and lies for it is well known that all people agreed upon giving vow of allegiance to Uthman and they did not agree on killing him; all of them gave him vow of allegiance, in all parts of the Islamic nation. Therefore, if it is right to attest and supports ones claims with apparent consensus, it is imperative to accept the allegiance given to him (as Caliph) in truth, because all people have agreed upon it and if it is not acceptable, then attesting with "consensus," on killing him is nullified because those who killed him are a small group of rebels. Shia Rafida are rejecting consensus on giving him vow of allegiance and they are saying: Those who have rights gave him vow of allegiance because they are forced and out of fear. It is well known that if they all agreed on killing him and someone says: Those who have rights hated killing him due to fear and dissimulation from themselves; this will be closer to the truth because it is customarily known that whoever want to kill leaders fears those who will challenge him, in contrast to the one who want to give vow of allegiance to leaders for he does not fear being challenged like the one who want to kill him; this is because those who want to kill are quicker in committing evil, spill blood and put people into fear than those who want to give vow of allegiance.

If we assume that all people have supported his murder, then why is it that the generality of the people opposed his murder and some of them defended him in his house, such as Hasan bin Ali and Abdullah bin Zubair etc.! The claim of a claimant about consensus on killing Uthman while it is very clear that the generality of the Muslim community have opposed that, rose up to defend him and sought for revenge against those who killed him, is a clearer lie than the claim of those who claimed that the Muslim community has agreed on killing Husain (r.a). if someone says: Husain has been killed by the consensus of people because those who fought him and killed him were not prevented by anybody from doing so, his lies will not be clearer than the lies of those claiming consensus on killing Uthman,

this is because the opposition of the Islamic community against killing Husain has not reached the extent of its opposition against the murder of Uthman, armies did not fight to his aid like the mighty armies that fought to aid Uthman after his murder, his supporters did not avenge his death from enemies with the intensity by which the supporters of Uthman avenged his murder against his enemies, his murder did not lead to a lot of evils, tribulations and corruption as is caused by the murder of Uthman and his murderers did not get the greatest opposition from Allah, His Messenger (s.a.w) and the believers as it has attained by the murder of Uthman; for surely Uthman was among the chiefs of the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar; he is of the social status of Ali, Talha and Zubair and he is the Caliph of the Muslims who they have all agreed upon and gave him their vows of allegiance. Nay, he never unsheathe his sword against the Islamic community and he did not kill anyone for the sake of leadership and during his Caliphate weapons are directed against enemies of Islam^[99] and restrained against Muslims as it has been during the periods of Abubakar and Umar.

With regard to his words: “Aisha used to command people at that time saying: ‘Kill the useless old man, may Allah kill him,’ and when she heard that he was killed she became happy.”

We reply: Firstly, where is a sound hadith narration quoting Aisha as saying that?

Secondly, the sound hadith narrated from her contradicted what you have stated; she opposed that, censured those who killed him (and go after them seeking for justice to Uthman), and supplicated against her junior brother and other people who have participated in that evil action.

Thirdly, let us assume that one of the companions – Aisha or someone else - stated that in a fury in denunciation of some of the allegations against Uthman; his words are not an authority and does not prove anything; that do not impair the belief of either the one who made the statement nor the who it is made against him. Nay, all of them might be friends of Allah and denizens of Paradise and one of

them might think that the killing of the other is permissible, nay he may even think that he is an unbeliever while he is mistaken in his assumption and judgment.

*** It come in sound hadiths on the authority of Ali and other companions, concerning the story of Hatib bin Abi Balta'a, who is among those who witnessed the battle of Badr and the allegiance under the tree in Hudaibiyah. According to the Ali (r.a) who narrated saying: ***"Allah's Apostle sent me, Zubair and Miqdad saying, "Proceed till you reach Rawdat Khakh where there is a lady carrying a letter, and take that (letter) from her." So we proceeded on our way with our horses galloping till we reached the Rawda, and there we found the lady and said to her, "Take out the letter." She said, "I have no letter." We said, "Take out the letter, or else we will take off your clothes." So she took it out of her braid, and we brought the letter to Allah's Apostle . The letter was addressed from Hatib, bin Abi Balta'ah to some pagans of Mecca, telling them about what Allah's Apostle intended to do. Allah's Apostle said, "O Hatib! What is this?" Hatib replied, "O Allah's Apostle! Do not make a hasty decision about me. I was a person not belonging to Quraish but I was an ally to them from outside and had no blood relation with them, and all the Emigrants who were with you, have got their kinsmen (in Mecca) who can protect their families and properties. So I liked to do them a favor so that they might protect my relatives as I have no blood relation with them. I did not do this to renegade from my religion (i.e. Islam) nor did I do it to choose Heathenism after Islam." Allah's Apostle said to his companions." As regards him, he (i.e. Hatib) has told you the truth." 'Umar said, "O Allah's Apostle! Allow me to chop off the head of this hypocrite!" The Prophet said, "He (i.e. Hatib) has witnessed the Badr battle (i.e. fought in it) and what could tell you, perhaps Allah looked at those who witnessed Badr and said, "O the people of Badr (i.e. Badr Muslim warriors), do what you like, for I have forgiven you."*** Then Allah revealed the Chapter:--

‘O you who believe! Take not my enemies And your enemies as friends offering them (Your) love even though they have disbelieved in that Truth (i.e. Allah, Prophet Muhammad and this Quran) which has come to you(to the end of Verse)....(And whosoever of you (Muslims) does that, then indeed he has gone (far) astray (away) from the Straight Path’ (60.1), (Bukhari). This hadith is concurrent and the scholars of hadith, exegesis of the Qur’an, history, biographies, warfare and jurisprudence etc. have all agreed upon its soundness. Ali (r.a) used to tell this story during his Caliphate after the Fitnah (civil war). His secretary Abdullah bin Abi Rafi’ narrated this on his authority, while he was explaining to them that the first and foremost Muslims are forgiven despite what has occurred between them. Uthman, Talha and Zubair are better than – by the consensus of Muslims – Hatib bin Abi Balta’ah. Hatib used to mistreat his slaves and his sin for writing to the polytheists and aiding them over the Prophet (s.a.w) is greater than the sin that is ascribed to those people. Despite all that the Prophet (s.a.w) forbids killing him and denied the statement of the who said he is of the people of Hell Fire because he has witnessed the battle of Badr and the allegiance of Ridwan in Hudaibiyyah and he informed that Allah has forgiven the people of Badr. Umar said earlier: **“‘O Allah’s Apostle! Allow me to chop off the head of this hypocrite!** He called him a hypocrite and permitted slaying him, but that do not affect the belief of anyone of them and it did not remove them from being people of Paradise. The Prophet (s.a.w) replied Umar saying: **“He (i.e. Hatib) has witnessed the Badr battle (i.e. fought in it,) and what could tell you, perhaps Allah looked at those who witnessed Badr and said, "O the people of Badr (i.e. Badr Muslim warriors), do what you like, for I have forgiven you.”**

It also come in sound hadith, in the story of slander, when the Prophet (s.a.w) stood up on the pulpit delivering sermon and making plea against the leader of the hypocrites, Abdullah bin Ubay bin Salul, part of the hadith stated: **“... So, on that day, Allah’s Apostle got up on the pulpit and complained about ‘Abdullah bin Ubai (bin Salul) before his companions, saying, ‘O you Muslims! Who**

will relieve me from that man who has hurt me with his evil statement about my family? By Allah, I know nothing except good about my family and they have blamed a man about whom I know nothing except good and he used never to enter my home except with me.' Sad bin Mu'adh the brother of Banu 'Abd Al-Ashhal got up and said, 'O Allah's Apostle! I will relieve you from him; if he is from the tribe of Al-Aus, then I will chop his head off, and if he is from our brothers, i.e. Al-Khazraj, then order us, and we will fulfill your order.' On that, a man from Al-Khazraj got up. Um Hassan, his cousin, was from his branch tribe, and he was Sad bin Ubada, chief of Al-Khazraj. Before this incident, he was a pious man, but his love for his tribe goaded him into saying to Sad (bin Mu'adh). 'By Allah, you have told a lie; you shall not and cannot kill him. If he belonged to your people, you would not wish him to be killed.'

On that, Usaid bin Hudair who was the cousin of Sad (bin Mu'adh) got up and said to Sad bin 'Ubadah, 'By Allah! You are a liar! We will surely kill him, and you are a hypocrite arguing on the behalf of hypocrites.' On this, the two tribes of Al-Aus and Al Khazraj got so much excited that they were about to fight while Allah's Apostle was standing on the pulpit. Allah's Apostle kept on quietening them till they became silent and so did he" (Bukhari). Thus, Sa'ad bin Mu'adh stood up – and he is the one whose death shock the Throne of the Lord, he is the one who do not care about the blame of the blamer for the sake of Allah. Nay, he gave verdict against his allies the Jews of Bani Quraizah that; their fighters (able bodied men) shall be killed, their families taken as captives and their wealth taken as war booty, to the extent that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **"You have decided their fate with the verdict of Allah from above the seven Heavens."** - fighting was about to break between Aus and Khazraj to the extent that the Prophet (s.a.w) come down from the pulpit and calm them down. Those three men are among the best of the first and foremost Muslims and Usaid bin Hudair has said to Sa'ad bin Ubadah: **"We will surely kill him, and you are a hypocrite arguing on the behalf of hypocrites."**

This man is a believer among the friends of Allah, and of the people of Paradise, and that one is a believer, a friend of Allah and among the denizens of Paradise. This proved that a person can ascribe his brother to apostasy by interpretation, while in reality none of them is an unbeliever.

Some Prophet's companions hoped that the Prophet will pray against Malik bin Dukhshun so that he will be destroyed but he refused because he is a believer. In hadith narrated by Itban bin Malik: ***"...Many members of our family gathered in the house and one of them said, 'Where is Malik bin Al-Dukhaishin or Ibn Dukhshun?' One of them replied, 'He is a hypocrite and does not love Allah and His Apostle.' Hearing that, Allah's Apostle said, 'Do not say so. Haven't you seen that he said, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah' for Allah's sake only?' He said, 'Allah and His Apostle know better. We have seen him helping and advising hypocrites.' Allah's Apostle said, 'Allah has forbidden the (Hell) fire for those who say, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah' for Allah's sake only' (Bukhari).***

It is not conditional that a big man (or a friend of Allah) cannot commit sin and he cannot make mistake by Ijtihad and we never say that Uthman is infallible. Therefore, speaking about people shall be with sound knowledge and justice and not with stark ignorance and injustice as is the conduct of people of innovation. Surely, Shia Rafida will take the words of people who are close in virtues and then take the statement of one of them as infallible from sins and mistakes and the other as sinner, profligate, or unbeliever. And by that their ignorance and contradiction will become apparent; just like a Jew or a Christian, if he want to prove the Prophethood of Moses (a.s) or Jesus (a.s) and at the time object to the Prophethood of Muhammad (s.a.w); that is when his contradictions and ignorance will be glaringly apparent!!! Surely, there is no way by which they can prove the Prophethood of Moses (a.s) or Jesus (a.s) except that the Prophethood of Muhammad (s.a.w) is proven with similar proofs or stronger evidence. There is no ambiguity that can be advanced

against the Prophethood of Muhammad (s.a.w), except that it can be also be advanced against the Prophethood of Moses (a.s) and Jesus (a.s), with what is similar to it or stronger than it.

Whoever want to differentiate between two equals or commend something and criticize what is similar to it or its type or what more deserved to be commended than it or its contrary, will be inflicted with this type of contradiction, ignorance and weakness. The same thing could be said about scholars or Sheikhs; if one of them want to commend the person he is following and condemned someone who is similar to him or give precedence to one of them over the other, he will fall into this type of path.

The Rafidi stated: "Then she (Aisha) asked: 'Who became the Caliph?' They replied: 'Ali.' She then went out to fight him for the blood of Uthman. What is the sin of Ali in connection with that?"

We reply: If any one stated that Aisha, Talha, and Zubair have accused Ali as the person who killed Uthman and that they fought him because of that, he is telling clear lies. Nay, they sought for the murderers who took cover in the army of Ali, while they knew that he is absolved from the blood of Uthman the way they knew that they are also free and absolved from his blood in a greater measure. They are seeking for justice to be carried out on those who killed Uthman but those murderers have hid and mixed themselves in his army, in addition to their being protected by their various clans and tribes; these made them and Ali unable to exert justice upon them.

Whenever tribulations occurred the intelligent became incapable of thwarting and restraining the fools and thus the grand companions were unable to extinguish the fire of sedition and hindering its proponents, this is the case with all troublemaking as Allah the Most High has said: **"And fear the Fitnah (affliction and trial, etc.) which affects not in particular (only) those of you who do wrong (but it may afflict all the good and the bad people), and know that Allah is Severe in punishment" (8:25).** Whenever affliction takes place, none can be free from its contamination except who Allah has protected.

The Rafidi said: "What is the sin of Ali in his murder?"

We reply: This is a contradiction from him for he has stated that Ali (r.a) is one of those who sees fighting him and killing him as permissible and that he is one of those who incited people against him and many of his Shia and the Shia of Uthman are ascribing the murder of the Caliph to him; those people because they hated Uthman and these people because they hated Ali, but the generality of the Muslims knew that the two parties are liars against Ali.

Shia Rafida are saying that Ali is one of those who sees the killing of Uthman as permitted, nay even killing Abubakar and Umar and they believed that aiding and supporting killing him is an act of worship, obedience and nearness to Allah. Such a person whose beliefs are as mentioned; how can he say: What is the crime of Ali concerning that? This kind of absolvment suites only the Ahlus Sunnah, but Rafida are one of the greatest people in contradictions.

The Rafidi stated: "And how did Talha, Zubair and others obeyed her regarding that mission. With which face will they face the countenance of the Prophet (s.a.w)? This, although if one of us talked to the wife of someone, take her away from her house and travelled with her, he is one of his ardent enemies?"

We say: This of the contradictions of Rafida and their ignorance for they are slandering Aisha with great sins and among them there are those who are accusing her of profligacy from which Allah has absolved her through revelation; in the Qur'an.

Again due their extreme ignorance they are accusing other than her of the wives of Prophet of being adulteress and they are claiming that the wife of Prophet Noah (a.s) has been an adulteress and that the son that he invited to mount the ark with him is not his son, he is bastard and that the meaning of the words of Allah: "... **his work is unrighteous**" (11:46), is that this child is from an unrighteous work. Among them are those who are interpreting: "... **and Noah called out to his son...**" (11:42), it means her son and supporting their interpretation with: "**He said: "O Noah! Surely, he is not of your family..."**" (11:46). And they interpret the words of Allah: "**Allah sets forth an example for those who disbelieve, the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot. They were under two of our righteous slaves,**

but they both betrayed their (husbands by rejecting their doctrine)..." (66:10), the wife of Noah betrayed him on his bed and that she has been ugly.

On this issue they have followed the footsteps of hypocrites, profligates and slanderers who have slandered Aisha (r.a) with lies and betrayal of her husband and they never repent it is concerning them Allah's Apostle, while on the pulpit, said, ***"O Muslims! Who will help me against a man who has hurt me by slandering my family? By Allah, I know nothing except good about my family, and people have blamed a man of whom I know nothing except good, and he never used to visit my family except with me..."*** (Bukhari).

It is well known that the greatest hurt anybody can make a man feel is to call his wife an adulteress, and name him the husband of an adulteress; it is the greatest curse people use against each other. Allah has decreed punishment of slander against whoever accuses someone with illegal sexual intercourse for – partly - it is the greatest accusation that will remain with a person even if he is lied against, because it is difficult to stop people from doubting the accused, in contrast to accusing a person with unbelief (or of other sins) for it can be easily be countered by adhering to Islam and doing good works.

The belief of Ahlus Sunnah is that the wife of a Prophet has never committed illegal sexual intercourse and that the child of Noah (a.s) is his son as Allah has said and He is the Most Truthful of all those make statement: **"... and Noah called out to his son..." (11:42).** And He also said: **"... my son is of my family!" (11:45).** And again He said: **"O my son! Embark with us and be not with the disbelievers" (11:42).** Thus Allah and His Messenger are saying that he is his son but those liars are saying that he is not his son. Allah the Most Exalted did not say; "he is not your son," but He said; "he is not of your family." (Meaning he is not of those who believe in you, he is doing bad acts - unbelief).

It is of the ignorance of Rafida that they exalt the roots of Prophets: Their parents and children and they impair, damage and harm to

their wives. All these are nothing but partisanship and following of vain desires. They are exalting Fatima, Hasan and Husain and they are harming Aisha, the Mother of Believers – and they are saying, or those who are saying that among them: Azara the father of Abraham (a.s) was a believer and that the parents of our Prophet (s.a.w) have been believers to the extent that they are saying; if we accept that his parents are unbelievers: Some people will say, if the father of a Prophet is an unbeliever, then it is possible that his son is an unbeliever and therefore, there will not be any virtue in the ancestry.

*** Furthermore, this is among the contradictions of Shia Rafidah and their ignorance for in this instance they are honoring Aisha in order to disparage Talha and Zubair. They do not understand that if this disparagement is right, then disparaging Ali concerning that is more right. Certainly, Talha and Zubair are greatly honoring Aisha, they agree on what she say and carry out her orders. And they and her are the farthest people away from committing lewdness or supporting it. If it is right for the Rafidi to censure her with his words: “With which face will they face the countenance of the Prophet (s.a.w)? This, although if one of us talked to the wife of someone, take her away from her house and travelled with her, he is one of his ardent enemies?”^[100] A Nasibi can reply saying: With which face and countenance will a person face the Prophet (s.a.w), who when he fought his wife, he sent against her his followers who struck down her Camel and she fall down from her howdah (Camel sedan chair), and enemies are surrounding her from all directions like a person who will be taken as a slave by her captors. Is this not closer to disgracing the family of a person? This is lesser than taking her out of her home as a respected honored queen, who cannot be approached by anybody except with her permission. Neither Talha, nor Zubair, nor any person who is a foreigner to her is carrying her. In her army there are those who are among her prohibited degrees such as Abdullah bin Zubair, who is the son of her sister and it is permissible for him to seclude with her and aid her by the provisions of the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w) and the consensus of scholars.

Furthermore, a woman is allowed to travel with her prohibited degree by the provisions of the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w) and the consensus of scholars and she did not travel but with her prohibited degree. If Muhammad bin Abubakar is not in the army of Ali a foreigner will have extended his hand to her in order to help her. This is why she prayed against the person who extended his hand to her saying: "Whose hand is this? May Allah burn it in Fire!" He said: "Yes, my sister, in this world before the Hereafter." She replied: "In this world before the Hereafter." He was burnt with fire in Egypt.

If a Nasibi say: You are saying that the family of Husain was taken as war captives after he was killed. but what they did to him is similar to what has been done to Aisha, for after subduing her army she was taken back to her house in Madina and given her provisions. The same thing happened to the family of Husain; when they capture them, they were taken back to their families and given their provisions. If this is called taking as war captives and violating the sacredness of the Prophet (s.a.w), then it could be said that Aisha has been taken as war captive and the sacredness of the Prophet (s.a.w) was violated. Shia Rafidah are claiming that some people in Syria requested that Fatima bint Husain shall be handed over to him as maid and that she said: "Allah forbids! Except, if you disbelieve in our religion." If this has really occurred, it shall be known that those who requested Ali to take those who fought him of the people of the Camel and Siffin as war captives and turn their properties as war booty have committed greater sin and crime. Those people believe that they can take Aisha and other Muslims as war captives. Furthermore, those who advanced these request to Ali are adamant on their demand and believe that it is a religious precept which must be upheld, to the extent that they rebelled against Ali and he fought them over their beliefs (and actions). The person who demanded to turn Fatima bint Husain into slavery is an unknown person, who does not have any influence or proof to support his claim and he does not take what he has said as religious precept. Again, when his leader prevented him, he stopped and never returns to it. Therefore, those

who are permitting the violation of the sacredness of the blood of the Muslims and their properties and the violation of the sacredness of the Prophet (s.a.w) are in greater number in the army of Ali, than in the army of Banu Umayyah; this is an agreed upon fact among the scholars. Certainly, the Kharijites that rebelled from the army of Ali are eviler than the vilest men in the army of Mu'awiyah. This is why the Prophet (s.a.w) commanded fighting them.

The Shia Rafidah are greater liars, more unjust, more ignorant and closer to unbelief and hypocrisy than the Kharijites, but they (the Shia) are weaker than them and more meek and docile and both of them are from the party of Ali and his army. This is the main reason why Ali was not able to fight and defeat his opponents.

What we are aiming to prove here is that what they are mentioning of censure against Talha and Zubair, is also found in Ali in greater measure. If they replied that Ali is a Mujtahid in what he has done and that he is foremost on truth than Talha and Zubair! It will be said: Yes, and Talha and Zubair are also Mujtahids. And although Ali is better than them, but if what they have done is a sin, then what Ali has committed is a greater sin. If it is said: They forced Ali to do what he has done, because they are the people who brought her and thus, what he has done is attributed to them and not to him! It will be replied that: The same thing with Mu'awiyah, for when he was informed that 'Ammar has been killed and the Prophet (s.a.w) has said: "You ('Ammar) will be killed by an aggressive rebellious group," He replied: "Are we the people who killed him? Those who brought him and place him under our swords killed him." If this argument is rejected, then the argument of those who are saying: Talha and Zubair are the people who have done to Aisha what happened to her of humiliation and capture in the camp of Ali is also rejected. If this argument is accepted, the argument of Mu'awiyah will also be accepted. Shia Rafidah and men similar to them are men of ignorance and injustice. They advance arguments with what entailed the falsity of their words and reveal its self-contradiction. Certainly, if a similar argument is presented to them, their statements will be nullified and countered. And if a similar argument is not presented

against it, it become self-negated. This is because two similar things must be made (or treated) equal. Their result is vain desire devoid of knowledge. Allah the Most High said: **“But if they answer you not (i.e. do not believe in your doctrine of Islamic Monotheism, nor follow you), then know that they only follow their own lusts. And who is more astray than one who follows his own lusts, without guidance from Allah? Verily! Allah guides not the people who are Zalimun (wrong-doers, disobedient to Allah, and polytheists)” (28:50).**

The Rafidi stated: “Then how about when tens of thousands of Muslims have obeyed her on that, then aided her on fighting the Commander of the Believers and none of them aided the daughter of the Prophet (s.a.w) against Abubakar and nobody oppose him with even one word!!!”

We reply: This is one of the greatest proofs against you. This is because all sane men knew that those people loved the Messenger of Allah, they exalt him, honor him, honor his tribe and honor his daughter greater than their exaltation of Abubakar and Umar even if he is not the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); then how about when he is the Prophet of Allah (s.a.w). No man of intellect have any doubt that Arabs – the Quraish and the none Quraish – used to respect Banu Abdu munaf and honor it more that they respect and honor Bani Taym and Bani ‘Ady and that is why when the Prophet (s.a.w) died and Abubakar became the Caliph, his father was informed: “The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has died. He said: ‘This is a great occurrence. Then who succeeded him?’ They replied: ‘Abubakar.’ He asked: ‘Did Banu Abdu Munaf and Banu Mahkzum accept that?’ They replied him saying: ‘Yes!’ He responded: ‘That is the grace of Allah he bestows it upon whoever He likes.’” That is why Abu Sufyan went to Ali and asked him: “Did you accept that this affair shall be with Banu Taym?” Ali replied him saying: “O Abu Sufyan the affair of Islam is not like the affair of the time before its advent (ignorance).”

Therefore, none of the Muslims said that Fatima has been treated unjustly or that she has some rights with Abubakar or Umar, no one

said that they have cheated her and nobody even uttered a word in that regard; this showed the Prophet companions knew that she is not treated unjustly. If to say they knew that she has been oppressed, then their abandonment of aiding her is either due to weakness or negligence and wasting her right or hatred of her.

Whatever a human being wants to do with great will he can do it undoubtedly and if he does not like it although he can be able to do it, it is either he is ignorant of it or he has something that hindered him from carrying it out. So if to say that she is treated unjustly, with all her great standing and the great standing of her tribe, her relatives and that her father is the best of all created beings and the most beloved of his community and they knew that she has been cheated; they will be either unable to aid her or they have something that hindered them from aiding against the one who angered her; both options are false. This is because all of those people are not weak on speaking out the word of truth and they are men that can change what is greater than that. This and other reasons showed that the truth is contrary to what Rafida are saying of lies and fabrications and those people knew that Fatima is absolutely not wronged in any way. Then, how did they aided Uthman to the extent of spilling their blood and they cannot aid the one who is more loved to them than Uthman; that is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his family!

*** The same thing could be said concerning Ali, there is isn't any mutual ill-will between him and the generality of the Quraish, Ansar and Arabs, neither in Jahiliyyah (the period before Islam) nor in the period of Islam. Umar displays intense hatred against the Bedouin Arabs and he was hard against them. Their statements concerning his harshness are well-known. Despite all that, he become the leader over them and by the time he died, all of them are commending and praising him and everybody was saddened by his death. This proved that the issue is contrary to the beliefs of Rafidah and that they knew that absolutely, Fatima has not been treated unjustly. Furthermore, how can those people sought for justice over the murder of Uthman to the extent of shedding their bloods and losing their lives and they

cannot aid the Prophet (s.a.w) and his progeny? How can they fight on the side of Mu'awiyah to the extent of shedding their blood and losing their lives and they will not fight on the side of Ali (after giving vow of allegiance to Abubakar), and sacrificing their lives and at that time all Banu Abdu Munaf are on his side? Abbas bin Abdulmutallib is the leader of Banu Hashim and Abu Sufyan bin Harb is the leader of Banu Umayyah and all of them inclined towards Ali (for the Caliphate). Why didn't people fight with him at that time while the issue of the Caliphate is at its initial stage? Fighting at that time – if it is right – is foremost and Ali taking over the Caliphate is easier. Certainly, if some of them come and say that Ali is the legatee (appointed leader) – as claimed by Shia Rafidah – and we will not give vow of allegiance to anybody, for we will not disobey our Prophet (s.a.w) and we will not put forward the unjust, or the hypocrite from the clan of Banu Taym or Banu Ady over Banu Hashim. The generality of the people, nay all of them will have hearken to their call, especially if you consider the fact that Abubakar has nothing with which to induce them and has nothing with which he can threaten them. Let us assume that Umar and some men are supporting Abubakar, but those people are not stronger or greater in number than those who are with Talha, Zubair and Mu'awiyah, despite that Ali fought them. Certainly, if what Shia Rafidah are saying is true, Abubakar, Umar and the first and foremost Muslims would have been the most evil men on earth and the greatest men in terms of ignorance and injustice for they intentionally changed and commit injustice immediately after the death of their Prophet (s.a.w). All of these are known to be false, necessarily in the religion of Islam. This explained that the person who innovated and created the creed of Rafidah is a Zindiq, atheists, an enemy of the religion of Islam and the Muslims. They are not among the people of innovation who erred on interpretation of texts such as the Kharijites and the Qadriyyah even though the creed of Rafidah has spread among people that possess faith due to their extreme ignorance.

Furthermore, what the motive that made them to support Aisha in her campaign against those who killed Uthman and they will not

support Fatima against Abubakar? If their aim is to attain worldly benefits, they would have stood in support of the most honorable Arab tribe – Banu Hashim – in the first instance. This is why Safwan bin Umayyah al-Jamahi stated on the day of the battle of Hunain: “I swear by Allah, that I be led by a man from Quraish is more beloved to me than to be led by a man from Thaqif.” Safwan is the leader of those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka and here is he saying he prefers to be led by a leader from Banu Abdu Munaf than to be led by a leader from Banu Taym. Then, why did they not chose Abbas for he is closer to their need and inclination than Abubakar, if you assume that their craving is for worldly benefits? Therefore, their action proved that they placed the truth in its right place and position, affirmed it in its garb and come to it through its door.

SEGMENT: THEY NAMED ONLY AISHA AS MOTHER OF BELIEVERS AND THEY NAMED ONLY MU'AWIYYAH AS MARTENAL UNCLE OF BELIEVERS

The Rafidi stated: "And they named her (Aisha) mother of believers and they did not give the rest of wives that title. They also did not give Muhammad bin Abubakar her brother – despite his great status, his closeness to the station of his father and his sister, mother of believers – the title of maternal uncle of believers but they gave that title to Mu'awiyyah bin Abi Sufyan, because his sister Umm Habibah bint Abu Sufyan is one of the wives of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the sister of Muhammad bin Abubakar and her father are greater than the sister of Mu'awiyyah."

We reply as follows: With regard to his words: "They named her (Aisha) mother of believers and they did not give the rest of wives that title." Now this is a great false statement, which is very clear and very apparent to every person. I do not know whether this man and his like are telling lies intentionally or Allah has made their sights blinded due to their extreme vain desires to the extent that the falsity of this statement is hidden from them!? The Shia Rafida are objecting to some Nawasib, that when Husain said: "Don't you know that I am the son of Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet?" They replied: "By Allah, we do not know that." This is something that cannot be stated and nobody can deny the root of Husain except the one who commit falsehood and lied intentionally and the one whose sight has been blinded due to following his vain desires to the extent that this type of fact is hidden from him; surely the sight of vain desires are blind.

Rafida are greater in denying the truth intentionally and more blinded than those people; there are among them – those who belong to the sect of Nusairiyyah etc., - who are saying Hasan and Husain are not the children of Ali, nay they are the children of Salman al-Farisi. Among them there are those who are saying: Ali is not dead and

they say the same thing with regard to some men. Among them there are those who are saying Abubakar and Umar are not buried beside the Prophet (s.a.w) and among them there are those who are saying: Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthum the wives of Uthman are not daughters of the Prophet (s.a.w), but they children of Khadijah from another husband. They have other arrogances and rejection of sure, certain knowledge that are known by necessity greater than what is committed by those Nawasib, who killed Husain and this is among what explained that they are greater liars, the most unjust and the most ignorant than those who killed Husain.

It is well known that each of the Prophet's wives are called "Mothers of Believers:" Aisha, Hafsa, Zainab bint Jahash, Umm Salma, Saudah bint Zam'ah, Mainunah bint Harith al-Hilaliyyah, Juwairiyyah bint Harith al-Mustalqiyyah and Safiyyah bint Hay bin Akhtab al-Haroniyyah (r.a). Allah said: **"The Prophet is closer to the believers than their ownelves, and his wives are their (believers') mothers (as regards respect and marriage)..." (33:6)**, and this is a general knowledge in the Islamic community. Muslims have agreed upon the illegality of marrying them after his death, by anybody and on the obligation of honoring and respecting them; they are the mothers of believer in respect and prohibition of marrying them, and not in close blood relation; thus, those who are not their close relatives cannot seclude with them, or travel with them, the way a man can travel with his close relative of the prohibitive degree in marriage.

Since they are mothers of believers on the decree on prohibition of marriage and not on the consideration of being close relatives, scholars have differed on their brothers can they be called "maternal uncles of believers," or not? Some of them said: One of them can be called maternal uncle of believers. On this verdict the rule is not confined to Mu'awiyah, nay Abdurrahman and Muhammad the children of Abubakar are included in that. Abdullah, Ubaidullah and 'Asim the children of Umar are included in that. 'Amr bin Harith bin Abi Dirar the brother of Juwairiyyah bint Harith is included in that and

Utbah bin Abi Sufyan, and Yazid bin Abi Sufyan, the brothers of Mu'awiyyah are also included in that.

Among the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah there are those who said: The title "maternal uncle of believers," shall not be given to brothers of wives of the Prophet (s.a.w), for if it is given to them, it would also be given to their sisters as maternal Aunts of believers, and thereby marrying them by a believer will be prohibited and likewise the women will not be married by their maternal uncles by law.

It is affirmed by texts and by the consensus of Muslims that is it allowed for believing men to marry the brothers and sisters of the Prophet's wives, just as Abbas married Umm Fadl, the sister of Mainunah bint Harith, the mother of believers, who beget children for him namely, Abdullah and Fadl etc., in like manner Abdullah bin Umar, Abdurrahman bin Abubakar and Muhammad bin Abubakar are married to believing women and if they have been their maternal aunts it would have been prohibited.

Those who call one of them as maternal uncle of believers are not contradicting any law because they meant by that title that the one so addressed is an in law of the Prophet (s.a.w). It only happened that calling Mu'awiyyah with the title is more popular than with other people, the way also calling him the scribe of revelation is popular with him though he is not the only scribe of the revelation, he is called "rear man" (riding on the same animal) of the Prophet although he is not the only man the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) carried at the rear of his mounted animal (as he rode on it); they are not mentioning these things because they are exclusively his trait, nay they are only mentioning some of his connections and relationships with the Prophet (s.a.w), the way they mentioned the virtues of other companions which he has not attained.

With regard to his words: "Despite his great status." If the Rafidi means by that greatness of ancestries, then his lineage has no respect among them (Shia) because they are attacking and disparaging his father and sister. With regard to Ahlus Sunnah; they exalt a person and respect him by his consciousness of Allah and

not just because of ancestry. Allah said: **“O mankind! We have created you from a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know one another. Verily, the most honorable of you with Allah is that (believer) who has At-Taqla (pious). Verily, Allah is All-Knowing, All-Aware” (49:13).** And if he means by “his great status;” due to his precedence (in entering Islam), his migration to Madina, his aiding Islam and his Jihad; then it shall be known that he (Muhammad bin Abubakar – he was born during the Caliphate of Abubakar) is not among the Prophet’s companions; neither of the Muhajirun nor of the Ansar. And if he mean by “his great status,” he is the most knowledgeable or the greatest of religious men; then the matter is not like that.

Words of the Rafidi: “The sister of Muhammad bin Abubakar and her father are greater than the sister of Mu’awiyah.” The reply is that: This argumentation is false on the two basis and that is because Ahlus Sunnah do not exalt a person except by his own achievements and therefore, his being close to Abubakar and Aisha will not benefit him and it will not harm Mu’awiyah if he has better roots than him. This is a known principle among Ahlus Sunnah. The first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar, who spent their wealth in the way of Allah and fought in his path before the conquest of Makka, such as Bilal, Suhaib, and Khabbab etc., will not be harmed because they have less ancestry than those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka, such as Abu Sufyan bin Harb and his two sons: Mu’awiyah and Yazid, Abu Sufyan bin Harith bin Abdulmutallab, ‘Aqil bin Abi Talib etc., who have greater ancestry than them.

SEGMENT: ON DEFENDING MU'AWIYYAH FROM DEFAMATIONS OF RAFIDA AND THEIR COLUMNY

The Rafidi stated: "Although the Prophet (s.a.w) has cursed Mu'awiyah, the Taliq (pardoned) son of a pardoned, the cursed son of a cursed father and he said: 'If you see Mu'awiyah on my pulpit, kill him.' He is one of those whose hearts are conciliated to Islam. He fought Ali, - who according to them – is the fourth Caliph; he is the reigning leader and whoever fought a reigning leader is an aggressor, the unjust."

The Rafidi added: "The reason for (calling Mu'awiyah maternal uncle of believers and not calling Muhammad bin Abubakar) with that title, is because Muhammad bin Abubakar loved Ali and abandoned his father and the hatred of Mu'awiyah to Ali and fighting him. They named him the scribe of the revelation and he did not write for him even one word of the revelation. Nay, he used to write letters for him and before the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) there are fourteen men who used to write revelation for him; the first among them, the most near to him and the most close to him is Ali bin Abi Talib. (They are saying that) although Mu'awiyah continued to be a polytheists throughout the period of Muhammad's Prophethood; he was denying the revelation and mocking the Shari'ah (Islamic law)."

We reply: With regard to what he has mentioned that the Prophet (s.a.w) has cursed Mu'awiyah and commanded that he shall be killed whenever he is seen on his pulpit; that hadith is not found in the books of Islam that could be referred to in order to acquire knowledge of sound hadith. It is to the scholars of hadith a fabricated, lied, and coined against the Prophet (s.a.w) and this Rafidi who has mentioned it did not mention its chain of authority so that it can be investigated. Sheikh Abu Faraj bin Jawzi has mentioned it in his book on the fabricated hadiths (titled al-Maudu'at).

What will further explain to you the falsity of that hadith is that many people have mounted the pulpit of the Prophet (s.a.w) after Mu'awiyah and he is better than them by consensus of Muslims. If it imperative to kill whoever mounted it, just because he has mounted it, then all those people shall necessarily be killed. This hadith has contradicted what is naturally known out of necessity in the religion of Islam; just mounting a pulpit does not make killing a Muslim obligatory. If he commanded that he shall be killed because he became the ruler while he does not deserve it; then it is obligatory to kill whoever became the ruler after Mu'awiyah among those who he is better than. That hadith (which has been mentioned by the Rafidi) has contradicted concurrent hadiths that come from the Prophet (s.a.w) in which he forbids killing rulers or fighting them (in rebellion); the Islamic community has agreed upon contradicting such a conduct and never allowed it. In addition to the above mentioned reasons such an action will cause corruptions and tumults greater than the administration of an unjust ruler. How can the Prophet (s.a.w) command a thing which if acted upon is more corrupt than abandonment?

With regard to the Rafidi's statement: "He is a pardoned and the son of a pardoned." We reply: This description is not a censure or a defect, for the Tulaqaa (those who are pardoned) are those who entered into Islam immediately after the conquest of Makka and the Prophet (s.a.w) pardoned them (for their oppositions against Islam and the atrocities they committed against Muslims). They are about two thousand men and among them there are those who became among the best Muslims, such as Harith bin Hisham, Suhail bin 'Amr, Safwan bin Umayyah, 'Akramah bin Abi Jahal, Yazid bin Abi Sufyan, Hukaim bin Huzam, Abu Sufyan bin Harith bin Abdulmutallab, a cousin of the Prophet who use to disparage him through poetry, but he made good his Islam and Attab bin Usaid who the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed as the governor of Makka after its conquest etc.

Mu'awiyah is one of those who made there Islam good by the consensus of those with knowledge and that is why Umar bin

Khattab (r.a) appointed him the governor of Syria after the death of his brother Yazid bin Abi Sufyan. Yazid bin Abi Sufyan is one of the best people and he is one of the commanders that were sent to Syria by Abubakar and Umar in order to conquer it, the rest of them are: Shurahbil bin Hasanah, 'Amr bin 'As, Abi 'Ubaidah bin Jarrah, and Khalid bin Walid. When his brother Yazid bin Abi Sufyan died in Syria as its governor, Umar bin Khattab appointed him as its governor and everybody knew that Umar is one of those who do not care with the blame of the blamer in the path of Allah; he is not one of those who are partisan in making appointments and he is not one of those who love his father, Abu Sufyan. Nay, he is one of those who greatly hated him before Islam to the extent that when Abbas brought him to the Prophet (s.a.w) on the day of the conquest of Makka, Umar greatly desired to kill him to the point of entering into hot argument with Abbas due to his hatred against Abu Sufyan. Thus, appointment of his son Mu'awiyah as governor of Syria is not motivated by worldly reasons; if he does not deserved to be a governor, he would not have appointed him.

With regard to his words that: "Mu'awiyah is one of those whose hearts are conciliated (prepared to accept) Islam." We reply: Yes, that is true and most of those who have been pardoned are among those whose hearts are attracted to incline towards Islam (through some gifts etc.). And those people latter on became the best of Muslims and made their Islam perfect; one of them in the beginning of the day will embrace Islam coveting worldly riches but by the end of the day Islam will be more beloved to him than all that the earth contained.

With regard to his words: "He fought Ali, - who according to them – is the fourth Caliph; he is the reigning leader and whoever fought a reigning leader is an aggressor, the unjust." We reply: Firstly: An aggressor might be relying on a sincere interpretation, thinking that he is right, or he might be committing aggression intentionally knowing fully that he is an aggressor or his aggression might be a compound of ambiguity and vain desires and this is the majority cases. On any of the considerations one rely, that do not affect what

the Ahlus Sunnah are on of opinion: They surely are not absolving Mu'awiyah or someone who is better than him from committing sins, then what more of absolving them from committing mistakes in their sincere judgments and opinions (based on Ijtihad)!!! Nay they are saying: Surely sins have grounds that put off there punishments, such as repentance, seeking Allah's forgiveness, good works that erase bad works, and trials by which Allah forgive sins etc., and this matter encompassed the companions and other people.

Secondly: The principles of Ahlus Sunnah on this issue are straightforward forward and continuous, but you (Rafida) are contradictory, and that is for instance, if Nawasib – among the Khawarij and other groups – who are ascribing Ali (r.a) to unbelief or profligacy or they doubt his justice among the Mu'atazilites and Marwaniyyah etc.! If they say to you: "What are the proofs of Ali's beliefs, justice, and his leadership?" You do not have any proof; this is because if you attest with what has come concurrently about his Islam and his worship, they will say to you: "It is has also come concurrently with regard to the Prophet's companions, those who come after them, the three Caliphs and the Caliphs of Bani Umayyah, such as Mu'awiyah, Yazid, Abdulmalik bin Marwan etc., and you people are disproving their belief. Therefore, our reproving faith of Ali and other people if compared to yours on those people, your own is greater and more intense and among those you are disproving there are those who are greater in status than those who we are disproving." And if you attest with verses of the Qur'an on praises and commendations they will say: "Verses of the Qur'an are general, they encompasses Abubakar, Umar and Uthman etc., in like manner that it encompasses Ali (r.a) and even greater than that and you people have excluded those people from praises and commendations and thus our exclusion of Ali is lighter."

If you say that you are basing your proofs on the virtues of Ali which come to us from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). They will say to you: "Those virtues have been reported by the companions who have also reported the virtues of those people. Thus, if they are reliable, you shall except all of them and if they are decadent, if a decadent

person brought to you an information you shall investigate it; and nobody shall say concerning witnesses; if they give testimony in my favor they are just and if they give testimony against me they are corrupt or; if they give witness in favor of the one I love they are just and if they give witness in favor of the one I hates they are corrupt.”

The Rafidi stated: “The reason for that is because Muhammad bin Abubakar loved Ali and abandoned his father.” We reply: This is a clear lie. This is because Muhammad bin Abubakar during the life of his father is a child who is less than three years and after the death of his father he is one of those who respect him greatly; by the status of his father he is honored and respected by people.

The Rafidi stated: “The reason for calling Mu’awiyah maternal uncle of believers and not calling Muhammad bin Abubakar with the same title, is because he loved Ali and Mu’awiyah hates him.” We reply: This is also a lie. Surely, if that is the case then Abdullah bin Umar more deserved to be given that title for he did not participated in the fight; neither with Ali nor with Mu’awiyah and he used to love, respect and honor Ali and he used to mention his virtues and grand traits, he also gave vow of allegiance to Mu’awiyah when all the people agreed on him. His sister is better than the sister of Mu’awiyah, and his father is better than the father of Mu’awiyah and people respect him and honor him more than Mu’awiyah and Muhammad bin Abubakar. Despite all these, he is not popular among people as the maternal uncle of believers and by this it is known that the reason for that is not what he has mentioned.

The Rafidi stated: “They named him the scribe of the revelation and he did not write for him even one word of the revelation, nay he used to write letters for him.” We reply: This is only a statement that has not been backed by any proof and is not based on sound knowledge. What is your reason for saying that he does not scribe even a word of the revelation but he wrote letters for him?

His words: “There are fourteen men who used to write revelation for the Prophet (s.a.w); the first among them, the most near to him and the most close to him is Ali bin Abi Talib.” We reply: There is no

doubt that Ali is one of those who used to scribe revelation for him and he is the one who scribe the treaty between him and the polytheists in the year of Hudaibiyyah, but Abubakar and Umar used to write and undoubtedly Zaid bin Thabit used to write also. It come in Bukhari and Muslim with regard to Zaid bin Thabit: Narrated Al-Bara: **“There was revealed: ‘Not equal are those believers who sit (at home) and those who strive and fight in the Cause of Allah...” (4.95).** The Prophet said, ***“Call Zaid for me and let him bring the board, the inkpot and the scapula bone (or the scapula bone and the ink pot).” Then he said, ‘Write: “Not equal are those Believers who sit...” (4:95).*** Those who used to write revelation for him included; Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Ali, ‘Amir bin Fuhairah, Abdullah bin Arqam, Ubai bin Ka’ab, Thabit bin Qais, Khalid bin Sa’id bin ‘As, Hanzalah bin Rabi’l al-Asadik, Zaid bin Thabit, Mua’awiyah and Shurahbil bin Hasanah (r.a).

With regard to his words: “Mu’awiyah continued to be a polytheist throughout the period of Muhammad’s Prophethood; he was denying the revelation and mocking the Shari’ah (Islamic law).” We reply: There is no doubt that Mu’awiyah, his father, his brother and others embraced Islam in the year of the conquest of Makka, before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) with about three years. Then how can he be a polytheist throughout the period of his Prophethood? Mu’awiyah was a little child when the Prophet was sent and his mother Hind used to make him dance (playfully). Mu’awiyah embraced Islam together with those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka, such as his brother Yazid, Suhail bin ‘Amr, Safwan bin Umayyah, ‘Akrimah bin Abi Jahal, and Abi Sufyan bin Harb, and those people before they embraced Islam are the greatest unbelievers and mightiest in fighting the Prophet than Mu’awiyah.

SEGMENT: DEFENDING MU'AWIYYAH FROM SHIA RAFIDA FALSE ALLEGATIONS

The Rafidi stated: "He (Mu'awiyah) was in Yemen on the day of the conquest of Makka disparaging the Prophet (s.a.w). He wrote a letter to his father censuring him for embracing Islam stating that: You have erred for embracing the religion of Muhammad!!!

The conquest of Makka was in Ramadan about eight years after migration of the Prophet to Madina. Mu'awiyah was still a polytheist. He runs away from the Prophet (s.a.w) because he has ordered that wherever he is found he shall be killed. He run to Makka and when he was unable to find a hiding place, he was forced to embrace Islam. He embraced Islam about five months before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). He sought refuge with Abbas who begged the Prophet (s.a.w) and he forgave him. Abbas again interceded for him to be honored and add him to the scribes. The Prophet (s.a.w) accepted his intercession and added him to the fourteen scribes. What is his fortune in this period even if we accepted that he was a scribe to the extent that he described with that title (scribe of the Prophet) to the exclusion of all others? Although al-Zamakshari – one of the scholars of Hanbaliyyah – mentioned in his book titled 'Rabi'ul Abrar,' that four people claimed Prophethood. Among the scribes there is Abdullah bin Sa'ad bin Sarh who apostate from Islam to polytheism, it is concerning him that this verse was revealed: **"Whoever disbelieved in Allah after his belief, except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with Faith but such as open their breasts to disbelief, on them is wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a great torment" (16:106).**

Abdullah bin Umar reported that, I went to the Prophet (s.a.w) and I heard him saying: 'A man will soon appear who will not die on my Sunnah.' At that moment Mu'awiyah appeared. One day the Prophet (s.a.w) stood up to deliver a sermon, and Mu'awiyah took hold of the hand of his son Zaid or Yazid and left without listening to the sermon. The Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'May Allah curse the leader

and the one led; which day Mu'awiyah will harm the Muslim community?'

He went to the extreme in fighting Ali, killed a lot of people among the companions, cursed him from the pulpits and continued cursing him for eight years until Umar bin Abdulaziz stopped it. He poisoned Hasan and his son Yazid killed Husain and took his women as captives. His father broke the tooth of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his mother ate the heart of Hamza, uncle of the Prophet (s.a.w)."

Replies to the above contentions are as follows: With regard to his statement that Mu'awiyah was in Yemen disparaging the Prophet (s.a.w) and he wrote to his father censuring him for embracing Islam. This statement is a known lie, because Mu'awiyah was in Makka and not in Yemen. His father embraced Islam before the Prophet (s.a.w) entered Makka (as conqueror) at the valley path of Zahran. At that time Abbas told the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) that Abu Sufyan loved to be honored and the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***'Whoever enters the house of Abu Sufyan is secured, whoever entered the mosque is secured and whoever throw away his weapons is secured' (Muslim).***

With regard to his saying: "The conquest of Makka was in the month of Ramadan, eight years after migration to Madina." This is correct.

With regard to his words: "Mu'awiyah was still a polytheist running away from the Prophet, who commanded that he shall be killed, he run away to Makka and when he did not find a hiding place, he was forced to go to the Prophet (s.a.w) and embrace Islam and that he became Muslim about five months before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w)."

The above assertions are of the greatest lies, for Mu'awiyah embraced Islam at the year of conquest of Makka by the consensus of all scholars. This Rafidi has already stated that: He is one of those whose hearts are being inclined towards Islam (and among the pardoned). Those whose hearts are conciliated to the truth were given shares from the booty of Hawazan by the Prophet (s.a.w) – the year of the battle of Hunain – and Mu'awiyah is one of those who

was give part of it. The Prophet (s.a.w) used to incline the hearts of chiefs, who are obeyed and respected by their clans. Thus, if Mu'awiyah is on the run, he is not among those whose hearts are inclined towards Islam; if he embraced Islam just five months before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) he did not benefit from the booty of Hunain!!! The person whose aim is to be secured will not need to be conciliated. Among the facts that exposes the lies of this Rafidi is that nobody among the Quraish embrace Islam latter than immediately after the conquest of Makka and the scholars of history and war campaigns have agreed upon the fact that Mu'awiyah is not one of those who the Prophet (s.a.w) gave order to be killed at sight on the day of conquest of Makka.

With regard to his words: "He deserved to be described as such to the exclusion of all other people." This is a lie against Ahlus Sunnah, because there is nobody among them who is saying: This is an exclusive trait or title of Mu'awiyah, nay he is one of the scribes of the revelation. With regard to Abdullah bin Sa'ad bin Sarh; he apostate from Islam and slandered the Prophet (s.a.w), thereafter he re-embrace Islam (and he was accepted).

With regard to his words: "The verse that was revealed concerning him is: **'Whoever disbelieved in Allah after his belief, except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with Faith but such as open their breasts to disbelief, on them is wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a great torment' (16:106)**. This statement is false, for this verse was revealed in Makka when 'Ammar and Bilal were forced to renounce Islam and Abdullah bin Sa'ad bin Sarh apostate in Madina after the migration. If it is accepted that the verse was revealed concerning him; the Prophet (s.a.w) has accepted his repentance; his return to Islam and took vow of allegiance from him.

With regard to his words: "Abdullah bin Umar reported that, I went to the Prophet (s.a.w) and I heard him saying: 'A man will soon appear who will not die on my Sunnah.' At that moment Mu'awiyah appeared. One day the Prophet (s.a.w) stood up to deliver a sermon, and Mu'awiyah took hold of his the hand of his son Zaid or Yazid and left without listening to the sermon. The Prophet (s.a.w) said:

‘May Allah curse the leader and the one led; which day Mu’awiyah will harm the Muslim community?’”

The reply is that: Firstly: We are demanding for the soundness of the hadith because attesting with a hadith is not allowed until it is sound. We are only saying this as a form of argumentation and for the sake of debate; otherwise we absolutely knew that it is a lie.

Secondly: This hadiths are fabricated lies by the consensus of those learned scholars of hadiths and it could not be found in any reference compendium of hadith which is referred to in order to know sound hadiths and it does not have any know chain of authority.

This man, who is attesting with it, did not mention a chain of authority for it and it is part of his ignorance to report this type of lies and ascribe it to Abdullah bin Umar (r.a) for he is the farthest of all people from disparaging the companions and the greatest of all people who reported their virtues and outstanding traits and his statements on praising Mu’awiyah are very well known among which is: “I have not seen a better administrator after the Prophet (s.a.w) than Mu’awiyah. He was asked: Even Abubakar and Umar? He replied: Abubakar and Umar are better than him, but I have not seen after the Prophet (s.a.w) a better administrator than him.” Imam Ibn Hanbal said concerning Mu’awiyah: “The master who is patient.” Mu’awiyah was generous and patient.

The sermons of the Prophet (s.a.w) is not just one, nay he used to deliver sermons on Fridays, ceremonies, pilgrimage and other occasions and Mu’awiyah and his father use to attend those sermons like all other Muslims. Is it at each sermon that they rose and left and the Prophet (s.a.w) allowed that? This is a disparagement of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the rest of the Muslims, for they are allowing two people to always stood up and leave; they do not attend sermons and Friday prayers; and if they used to attend all sermons, then what is wrong with them for refusing to listen to just one sermon before he state delivering it?

With regard to his words: “Mu’awiyah took hold of his the hand of his son Zaid or Yazid and left without listening to the sermon.” The

reply is that: Mu'awiyah did not have a child called Zaid, but Yazid is his son who took over power and authority after him and that what happens happened during his Caliphate; he was born during the Caliphate of Uthman by the consensus of scholars and Mu'awiyah did not have a child during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w). Hafiz Abul Fadl bin Nasir said: "Mu'awiyah sought for marriage during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) but he did not get married because he has no money, he got married during the Caliphate of Umar and he beget a son during the Caliphate of Uthman, in the year 27AH."

His words: "He went to the extreme in fighting Ali." There is no doubt that the two camps fought; Ali and Mu'awiyah at Siffin and Mu'awiyah is not one of those who prefer fighting, nay he is one of those who desired that there shall be no fighting; other people covet fighting more than him.

SEGMENT: STATEMENTS OF SHIA RAFIDA ARE SELF NEGATION

If these are clear to you, it will be said: Statements of Shia Rafida are the most corrupt words and the most contradictory, for they are intensifying the issue and sin over those who fought Ali and they are pampering and praising those who killed Uthman, although censure, blame and the sin of those who killed Uthman are greater than that of those who killed Ali. This is because Uthman is the Caliph over who all people agreed and accepted and he never kills a Muslim. They killed him asking him to resign from the Caliphate and his excuse that he will continue leading the Muslims is greater than the excuse of Ali in asking them to obey him; and the patient of Uthman until he was killed unjustly, a martyred without fighting to defend himself. Ali started fighting the companions of Mu'awiyah and they have not been fighting him, but they refused giving him vow of allegiance (until the killers of Uthman are dealt with justice).

If it is said: Uthman committed some actions that they hated!! We say: Those things do not permit his murder, nor does they permit his removal from leadership and if they permit killing him and removing him from leadership; then what they objected with regard to Ali did not permits giving him vow of allegiance.

With regard to his words: "The Caliphate is thirty years" and things like that; those hadiths are not well known to the extent that the people of Syria will know them because some exclusive people reported them and especially if you consider that they are not recorded in Bukhari and Muslim etc., for example Abdulmalik bin Marwan did not know what the Prophet told Aisha: ***"If your people had not been recently polytheists (and new converts to Islam), I would have demolished the Ka'ba, and would have brought it to the level of the ground and would have constructed two doors, one facing the east and the other one to the west, and would have added to it six cubits of area from Hjr, for the Quraish had reduced it when they rebuilt it"*** (Muslim), until after he has

demolished the building that was constructed by Ibn Zubair and then he was informed about the hadith of Aisha and he said: ***“If I had heard this before demolishing it, I would have left it in the state in which Ibn Zabair had built it” (Muslim).*** This although the hadith of Aisha is sound in accordance to men of knowledge and is recorded in Bukhari and Muslim, thus it is not farfetched that the hadith of: ***“The Caliphate will be thirty years after me and then it will become kingship,”*** to be unknown to Mu’awiyah and his companions. In the begging of the Caliphate of Ali, this hadith is not pin pointing him particularly, but its being indicative of that was known after his death, although it is not a text appointing a particular person as the Caliph. They (Mu’awiyah and people of Syria) are saying: If he cannot be able to do us justice (on punishing the murderers of Uthman) either due to some interpretations he understood or because he is weak and unable to aid us. Then it is not incumbent upon us to give our vows of allegiance to the person who we are oppressed in his Caliphate.

With regard to his words that: “Mu’awiyah has killed a lot of the Prophet’s companions.” We reply that: Those who are killed were killed from the two parties; these killed those and those killed these and most of those who love the fighting from the two groups neither obey Ali nor obey Mu’awiyah and Ali and Mu’awiyah desires the most restraining their men from fighting more than the fighters; they were overpowered in what occurred. It is well known that when the fire of tumult is ignited the best intelligent men can fail to extinguish it. Among the soldiers (igniting the fire) are people like Ashtar an-Nahk’i, Hashim bin ‘Utbah al-Mirqal, Abdurrahman bin Khalid bin Walid, Abi ‘Awar as-Silmi etc., who are urging people to fight on; a group ardently supporting for justice to Uthman and another group opposing them, a group is supporting Ali (to take vow of allegiance by all means) another group opposing them.

What he mentioned about cursing Ali; then know that reciprocal, mutual cursing took place between the two groups, just as fighting has taken place between them. That group used to curse the leaders of this group in their supplications and this group used to curse the

leaders of that group in their supplication, it was said that: each group used to do Qunut (supplication for damnation) against the other group. Fighting with hands (and weapons) is greater than mutual cursing with the tongue.

It is most astonishing and shocking that the Shia Rafida are objecting to cursing Ali, while they are cursing Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and ascribed them to apostasy, they and whoever loves them. Mu'awiyah and his companions never used to ascribe Ali to apostasy;^[101] those who are ascribing him to apostasy are the Kharijites, who have shot out of Islam and Shia Rafida are worst than them.

With regard to his words: "Mu'awiyah poisoned Husain." The reply is: This is what some people has mentioned, but that has not been proven with legal means or by a considered confession or by a sound reliable report. Thus, this is something which knowledge of is unattainable and speaking about it is talking without knowledge.

With regard to his words: "Yazid killed our master Husain and took his women as captives."

We reply that: Surely Yazid did not command the killing of Husain by the consensus of scholars, but he wrote to Ibn Ziyad (his governor) to prevent him from (taking over) the governorate of Iraq. Husain thought that the people of Iraq will aid him and discharge and fulfill the promises that they wrote to him, so he sent to them his cousin Muslim bin 'Aqil and after they killed Muslim, they betrayed him and gave Ibn Ziyad their vows of allegiance. Husain decided to go back from where he comes from but he was intercepted by the unjust army. He asked them to allow him to go to Syria and meet Yazid or to go to a frontier of the Islamic state or to allow him go back to his country, but they refused all these options and demanded that he shall surrender himself and be taken as a captive, and he refused. They fought him until he was killed unjustly, a martyred. When the news of his murder reached Yazid he was sad and unhappy about it and the whole of his house broke into wailing and crying over Husain. None of the women of Husain is taken as captive or an

acquired slave. Nay he honored them in his house, gave them gifts and sent them back to Madina.

With regard to his words: “His father broke the tooth of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his mother ate the heart of Hamza, uncle of the Prophet (s.a.w).” The reply is: There is no doubt that Abu Sufyan was the leader of the polytheists in the battle of Uhud and in that day the tooth of the Prophet (s.a.w) was broken; it was broken by some polytheists, but nobody said that it was broken by Abu Sufyan. The tooth of the Prophet (s.a.w) was broken by ‘Utbah bin Abi Waqqas. Hind took the heart of Hamza and chew it, but she was not able to swallow it and so she threw it out. That was before they become Muslims, but after that they embraced Islam and they made good their religion; they and Hind. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) used to honor Hind and Islam erases whatever has been committed before it. Allah the Most High has said: **“Say to those who have disbelieved, if they cease (from disbelief) their past will be forgiven...” (8:38).**

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ABOUT KHALID BIN WALID, THE SWORD OF ALLAH

The Rafidi stated: "They name Khalid bin Walid the sword of Allah in opposition to Ali, who more than anybody deserved the title for he has killed with his sword a lot of unbelievers."

We reply: With regard to naming Khalid bin Walid, the sword of Allah; that title is not exclusive to him, nay he is: **"A sword among the swords of Allah that Allah has sent against the polytheists" (Ahmad)**. This is how the title comes from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and he is the first person to name him with that title, in hadith narrated by Anas bin Malik: **"The Prophet had informed the people of the martyrdom of Zaid, Ja'far and Ibn Rawaha before the news of their death reached. The Prophet said, 'Zaid took the flag (as the commander of the army) and was martyred, then Ja'afar took it and was martyred, and then Ibn Rawaha took it and was martyred.' At that time the Prophet's eyes were shedding tears. He added, 'Then the flag was taken by a Sword amongst the Swords of Allah (i.e. Khalid) and Allah made them (i.e. the Muslims) victorious'" (Bukhari, Ahmad)**.

With regard his words: "Ali deserved that title more than anyone else." We reply: Firstly: Who is opposing that? Who said that Ali is not a sword among the swords of Allah? The statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) in that sound hadith showed that Allah has many swords and we have no doubt that Ali is one of the greatest swords of Allah. Nobody among the Muslims prefers Khalid over Ali, so that somebody can say: They have confined that title only to Khalid!! The Prophet (s.a.w) gave him that title, saying: **"Surely, Khalid is a sword among the swords of Allah."**

Secondly: Ali has greater status than Khalid and his virtues are greater than being confined to a sword among the sword of Allah. The uses of sword is in fighting and fighting is only one of the virtues of Ali, in contrast to Khalid, for it is his only virtue by which he is differentiated from other people; he did not excel with an outstanding

work, or abundant scholarship, or be a great abstemious, but he excel in fighting; and that is why he is called a sword among the swords of Allah.

With regard to his words: "Surely Ali killed with his sword the unbelievers." We reply saying: Undoubtedly he did not kill but some unbelievers and the same is the case with all those who are popular as fighters among the companions, such as Umar, Zubair, Hamza, Miqdad, Talha, al-Barra'u bin Malik etc.; there isn't anyone among them except that he has killed with his sword a number of unbelievers and al-Barra'u bin Malik killed one hundred men through dual fight, in addition to those he shared in killing.

With regard to his words: "The Prophet (s.a.w) said; Ali is the sword of Allah and the arrow of Allah." We reply that: This hadith is unknown in any book of hadith and it hasn't got a known chain of authority. Its meaning is false, because Ali is not the sword of Allah and His arrow; this sentence apparently entailed restriction (of the title only to Ali). What the Rafidi quoted that Ali has said while he is on the pulpit: "I am the sword of Allah upon His enemies and His mercy upon His friends." This too hasn't got any chain of authority and its reliability is not known, but if its meaning is correct, then it is a shared trait between him and those who are similar to him.

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: "Khalid bin Walid continued to be an enemy of the Prophet (s.a.w) and a denier of his message."

We say: That was before he become a Muslim, and all his companions used to be his enemies and deniers of his message before they embraced Islam; all the Bani Hashim and those who are not of the Bani Hashim, such as Abu Sufyan bin Harith bin Abdulmalik, his brother Rabi'ah, Hamza his uncle and 'Aqil (his uncle) etc. (used to be his enemies and denier of his message).

With regard to what the Rafidi stated: "He (Khalid) was sent by the Prophet (s.a.w) to Bani Jazimah to collect from them Zakat; he betrayed him, counter his instructions and killed Muslims. The Prophet (s.a.w) stood up and delivered a sermon censuring him and opposing what he has done, raising his hands until the whiteness of

his armpits are seen, while he is supplicating: ‘O Allah, I am absolving myself from what Khalid has done.’ He therefore sent Ali after him so that he can repair what he has damaged and to conciliate the people on what has occurred.”

The reply to the above presentation is: This report contained a lot of ignorance and alterations that are not hidden to those who knew history. The Prophet sent him to invite them to Islam after the conquest of Makka and instead of them to say we accept Islam they used presumptuous words that are used to deride Islam. Khalid did not accept that from them; saying: This is not Islam, and he put them to the sword. Those who are with him of the grand companions, such as Salim the client of Abu Huzaifah, Abdullah bin Umar etc., objected to his action. When the news reached the Prophet (s.a.w), he raised his hands to the sky and supplicated: ***“O Allah, I am absolving myself from what Khalid has done,”*** because he feared that Allah will hold him accountable on what has occurred to those people of aggression. Allah the Most High said: **“Then if they disobey you, say: ‘I am innocent of what you do’ (26:216).** Then he sent Ali with money and he paid half of the blood money (for each killed person), he paid to them whatever has been destroyed – even dogs food plate – and he gave them the rest of the money as a precautionary measure (contingency) in case if any case has been omitted.

Despite all these the Prophet (s.a.w) did not remove Khalid from the command of the army and he continued appointing him and putting him forward. This is because, if a leader commits mistake or sin, he will be requested to rectify it and or repent from that; but he will be allowed to continue his leadership. Khalid has never been strong headed against the Prophet (s.a.w), nay he is always obedient to him, but he is not well grounded in jurisprudence and religious knowledge like other companions and thus the correct verdict on that issue was hidden to him.

The Rafidi stated: “He (Ali) was asked to conciliate the people from what he has committed.” The reply is that: This is a statement of an ignorant person, for the Prophet (s.a.w) sent him to pay blood money

and compensations for what has been destroyed of their properties and not just to conciliate them.

With regard to the Rafidi's words concerning Khalid: "He betrayed him, contradicted his command and killed Muslims." The reply is that: This is a lie against Khalid for he did not intentionally betray the Prophet (s.a.w); he neither contradicted his words, nor killed protected Muslims according to his estimation. Surely Khalid made mistake, the way Usama bin Zaid made mistake when he killed a man who declared: "There is nobody worthy of worship other than Allah;" and the way an army detachment killed the owner of some sheep who said: "I am a Muslim; but they killed him and took his sheep." [\[102\]](#)

SEGMENT: RAFIDA SUPPORT APOSTATES AGAINST ISLAM AND MUSLIMS

The Shia Rafidi stated: "When the Prophet (s.a.w) died, Abubakar sent him (Khalid bin Walid) to fight the people of Yamamah. He killed one thousand two hundred souls among them although they are Muslims. He killed the defenseless Malik bin Nuwairah, who is a Muslim and married his wife. They called Bani Hanifah apostates, because they refused to pay Zakat to Abubakar for they do not believe in his Caliphate. He legalizes shedding their blood, looting their wealth and taking their women as captives to the extent that Umar objected to his conduct. They named those who refused to pay Zakat apostates, and they did not name those who legalizes Muslims blood and fighting Ali as apostates, although they have heard the words of the Prophet (s.a.w): 'O Ali, fighting you is fighting me and making peace with you is making peace with me.' Whoever fought the Prophet (s.a.w) is an unbeliever by consensus."

We reply as follows: Allah is the Greatest over those liars, apostates, followers of apostates (and supporters of apostates) who have displayed enmity against Allah, His Messenger, His Book and His religion. They have shot out of Islam and have relegated it behind their backs, they have abandoned Allah, His Prophet (s.a.w) and the believers and they have befriended and supported the people of dissention and apostasy. This statement and similar one made by this Rafidi are substantiating that those people are ardent enemies of Abubakar as-Siddiq and his party and that they are of the species of apostates and unbelievers; they are similar to the apostates that have been fought by Abubakar as-Siddiq.

This is because the people of Yamamah are Bani Hanifa, who believed in the prophethood of Musailamah the liar, who has claimed prophethood during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w). In the beginning he went to Madina and shows that he is a Muslim and said: "If Muhammad appoints me as his successor, I will believe in him." When he went back to Yamamah, he claimed that he is a partner of

the Prophet (s.a.w) and that the Prophet (s.a.w) has testified to his truthfulness. A man called Rajjal bin 'Unfuwah gave testimony in his support. He composed a Qur'an in which he stated: "By the one who grind well. By the one who mix the dough well. By the one who made the bread well and then pour oil on it. Surely the earth between us and Quraish is divided into two, but Quraish are a people unjust." He also composed as his Qur'an, may Allah curse him the following: "O frog, daughter of frogs. Croak, how many times you are croaking? You do not make water turbid and you do not prevent a drinker. Your head is in water and your tail in mud." He also composed as his Qur'an may he be cursed: "The elephant! What is an elephant? And what would have you know what the elephant is? It has a scraggly tail and a very long trunk. Surely that is of the creation of our Lord the Sublime." He has other disgusting, irrational, statements^[103] and deliriums. When some of his followers read them to Abubakar as-Siddiq, he said: "Woe upon you! Where are your senses? Surely those words did not emanate from Allah."

This liar once wrote to the Prophet (s.a.w): "From Musailamah the prophet of Allah to Muhammad the Prophet of Allah. I am surely made an associate to you" The Prophet (s.a.w) replied him: "From Muhammad the Messenger of Allah to Musailamah the liar..." When the Prophet (s.a.w) died, Abubakar sent Khalid bin Walid to fight him and he fought him together with those he led of the Muslims. Before that, Khalid has also fought Tulaiha al-Asadi who has also claimed prophethood and he was followed by the people of Najad. After Allah has given victory to the believers over those people and they were defeated; 'Ukasha bin Muhsin was killed that day and Tulaiha al-Asadi embraced Islam. The Muslims then moved towards Musailamah the liar at Yamamah and the believers met very top steadfastness in fighting from his followers. Some grand companions were killed while fighting him such as, Zaid bin Khattab, Thabit bin Qais, Usaid bin Khudair etc.

Summarily the affairs of Musailamah the liar; his claim to prophethood, his being followed by Bani Hanifa and his being fought by Abubakar as-Siddiq are concurrently, well known issues;

everybody knew them, so also other similar issues; these are events that are not known only to a particular people; nay the knowledge of people about these events is greater than their knowledge with regard to the battles of Camel and Siffin; it has been mentioned that some scholastic theologians have objected to the occurrence of those battles, and similar objection – although it is false – has not been made in disputation to the occurrence of the fight against the people of Yamamah; that Musailamah the liar has claimed prophethood and that they fought him on that account.

Those Rafida's objections and ignorance on this matter is like their objection to the fact that Abubakar and Umar have been buried beside the Prophet (s.a.w), their objection that Abubakar and Umar loves and aides the Prophet (s.a.w), their claim that the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed Ali to succeed him. Nay, among them there are those who are objecting to the fact that Ruqayyah, Zainab and Umm Kulthum are daughters of the Prophet (s.a.w). They are saying that they are the children of Khadijah from her first husband who she married; he is an unbeliever, before the Prophet (s.a.w). Among them there are those who are saying Umar seized the daughter of Ali by force and this made him to consent to her marriage to him by force. Some of them are saying that the companions punched the stomach of Fatima and this caused her to commit miscarriage and that they demolished the roof of her house over those who are inside it. There are a lot of other lies, which are known by those with limited knowledge as lies and fabrications. Always the Shia Rafida will reject what is concurrently known as facts and reality and then they will go to things that do not exist and has no reality and affirm them. They have the greatest share of the words of Allah: **“And who does more wrong than he who invents a lie against Allah or denies the truth, when it comes to him?” (29:68).**

They are claiming that Abubakar and Umar and whoever follows them have apostate from Islam. Everybody knew that it is Abubakar who has fought the apostates. Therefore, if they are claiming that the people of Yamamah have been treated unjustly, that they have been killed oppressively without right, and that they are objecting to

fighting those people and finding excuses for them; these showed that these descendants are the offspring's of those predecessors and that Abubakar as-Siddiq and his followers are fighting apostates at all periods and times.

The Rafidi stated: "They named Bani Hanifa as apostates because they did not give Zakat to Abubakar." We reply that: this is a clear lie which is explained thus: He fought Bani Hanifa because they believed in Musailamah the liar and believed in his prophethood. Those who refused paying Zakat are another people and not Bani Hanifa and some companions have some doubts concerning fighting them. With regard to Bani Hanifa; nobody has any doubt on the obligation of fighting them.

When Abubakar decided to fight those who refused to pay Zakat, Umar said to him: ***"O successor of the Prophet (s.a.w); Why would you fight against the people, when the Messenger of Allah declared: I have been directed to fight against people so long as they do not say: There is no god but Allah, and he who professed it was granted full protection of his property and life on my behalf except for a right? His (other) affairs rest with Allah. Upon this Abubakar said: By Allah, I would definitely fight against him who severed prayer from Zakat, for it is the obligation upon the rich (therefore it is a right). By Allah, I would fight against them even to secure the cord (used for hobbling the feet of a camel) which they used to give to the Messenger of Allah (as zakat) but now they have withheld it. Umar bin Khattab remarked: By Allah, I found nothing but the fact that Allah had opened the heart of Abubakar for (perceiving the justification of) fighting (against those who refused to pay Zakat) and I fully recognized that the (stand of Abubakar) was right" (Muslim).***

Those people are not fought because they refused to give Zakat to Abubakar, for if they have taken it out of their properties and given it out to the poor, who deserved it by themselves he will not fight them for it. This is the statement of most of the scholars, such as Imam Ahmad and Imam Abu Hanifa etc., they stated that if they say to him:

We will give it out ourselves, we will not give it to the Imam; he is not compelled to fight them. Abubakar as-Siddiq never fight anybody to obey him and he did not make it compulsory for all people to give him vow of allegiance and that is why when Sa'ad refused to swear allegiance to him he never compel him to do so.

The Rafidi stated: They call Bani Hanifa apostates because they did not give Zakat to Abubakar for they do not believe in his leadership.” We reply that: This is a great lie and a mighty slander. The same thing applies to his words: “Umar objected to fighting Bani Hanifa.”

The Rafidi stated: “They did not name those who shed blood of Muslims as apostates, although they heard the words of the Prophet (s.a.w): ‘O Ali, fighting you is like fighting me, and making peace with you is like making peace with me,’ and whoever fight the Prophet (s.a.w) is an unbeliever by consensus.”

We reply that: their claim that they heard this hadith from the Prophet (s.a.w) or from Ali is a lie against them. Who are the people who reported that they heard those statements from them? This hadith is not in any of the known books of hadith and it has not been narrated with a known chain of authority. If the Prophet (s.a.w) has said it, it is not imperative that they have heard it; surely none of them have heard it; surely none of them heard all what the Prophet (s.a.w) has said. Then how about when it is known that the Prophet (s.a.w) has not stated it and that it has not been narrated with known chain of authority? Nay, how about if it is known to be fabricated lie against the Prophet by the consensus of scholars of hadith? Ali did not fight in the battles of the Camel and Siffin with a command from the Prophet (s.a.w), but it is his assessed opinion. Abu Dawud recorded in his Sunan: from Isma'il bin Ibrahim al-Huzaili, from ibn 'Aliyyah, from Yunus, ***from Qais bi 'Ubbad who said, I asked Ali: Inform me about this your travel: is it a command which was given to you by the Prophet (s.a.w) or an opinion that you see? He replied: The Prophet (s.a.w) did not command me anything, it is just an opinion that I see” (Abu Dawud).***

If those who fought Ali are apostates, he would have treated them as apostates. It has been concurrently reported from Ali in the day of the battle of the Camel, while he was fighting them that he does not chase those who are running away, the wounded are not killed, their properties are not taken as booty and their children and women are not taken as slaves. He commanded an announcer to announce those rules among his army. If he has taken them as apostates he will have gone after the escaping, killed the wounded (and took their properties as booty). Aisha (r.a) was among them: If you say: She is not our mother, you have apostate from Islam by the text of the Qur'an, and if you say: She is our mother and permitted using her as a slave, you have apostate from Islam by the text of Qur'an.

If the people are apostates and Hasan (r.a) step down from the leadership of the Muslims and handed over the government to an apostate, an unbeliever: According to them he is infallible and he handed over the affairs of Muslims to apostates; this is not a conduct of a believer; then what more of the infallibles!!!

Again, if those people are apostates and the believers are the followers of Ali, then it means that the apostates, unbelievers are overcoming (and have overcome) the believers, and this is in contrast to the words of Allah: **“Verily, We will indeed make victorious Our Messengers and those who believe (in the Oneness of Allah Islamic Monotheism) in this world's life and on the Day when the witnesses will stand forth, (i.e. Day of Resurrection)” (40:51).**

Again, Allah the Most High has said in His Book: **“And if two parties or groups among the believers fall to fighting, then make peace between them both, but if one of them rebels against the other, then fight you (all) against the one that which rebels till it complies with the Command of Allah; then if it complies, then make reconciliation between them justly, and be equitable. Verily! Allah loves those who are equitable” (49:9).** Thus, Allah has made them believers and brothers although there is fighting and aggression and rebellion (from one of the parties).

Furthermore, it has come in sound hadiths that the Prophet said: ***“A group would secede itself (from the Ummah) when there would be dissension among the Muslims. Out of the two groups who would be nearer the truth would kill them” (Muslim)***. In another hadith the Prophet said concerning Imam Hasan (r.a): ***“This son of mine is a master, he will bring peace between two great parties of Muslims” (Bukhari, Muslim)***. And he said to ‘Ammar: ***“You will be killed by a rebellious party” (Bukhari, Muslim)***. The Prophet (s.a.w) did not say by an unbelieving party.

These hadiths are sound according to the scholars of hadith, and it has been narrated with various chains of authorities that do not take from each other and these necessitate knowledge of its contents. The Prophet (s.a.w) has informed that the two parties that differed are Muslims and he praises the one who brought peace between them, he also informed that a group will secede itself from the Islamic community and that it will be fought by the party that is closer to the truth.

Then, we say to those Shia Rafida: If Nawasib said to you: Ali (r.a) has permitted shedding Muslims blood, and he fought without being commanded by the Prophet (s.a.w) over leadership. The Prophet (s.a.w) has said: ***“Abusing a Muslim is profligacy and fighting him is unbelief” (Bukhari, Muslim)***. He also said during the farewell pilgrimage: ***“You will soon meet your Lord and He will ask you about your deeds. So do not turn after me unbelievers (or misguided), some of you striking the necks of the others” (Bukhari, Muslim)***. Therefore, Ali (r.a) is an unbeliever. Your evidence and proofs will not be stronger than their argument and proof, because the hadiths they attested with are sound.

They (Nawasib) are also saying: Killing human beings is corruption and whoever kills people so that he can obtain obedience are among those who are pompous and exalt themselves in the land and these are of the characteristics of Pharaoh, Allah the Exalted has said: ***“That home of the Hereafter (i.e. Paradise), We shall assign to those who rebel not against the truth with pride and oppression in the land nor do mischief by committing crimes. And the good***

end is for the pious” (28:83). Thus, whoever wants corruption and exaltation in the earth is not of the people that will obtain felicity in the Hereafter. This cannot be compared to the fight of Abubakar as-Siddiq against apostates and those who refused to pay Zakat; this is because he fought them in order to make them submit themselves to Allah and obey Him and His Messenger (s.a.w) and not so that he will be obeyed by people. Zakat is obligatory upon them and he fought them so that they accepted it and pay it in contrast to the one who fought so that he can be obeyed.

SEGMENT: DISPROVING AND NEGATING SHIA VIEW THAT MU'AWIYYAH IS WORST THAN SATAN

The Rafidi stated: "Some noble men have done well when they said: The one who is worse than Satan is that person who did not pass him in past obedience and he went hand in hand with him at his arena of disobedience. Surely, scholars have explained that Satan is the greatest worshipper among the Angels, he carried the Throne of Allah alone for six thousand years. When Allah created Adam, he made him a successor in the earth and commanded him (Satan) to bow down, but he became arrogant and thus he deserved curse and expulsions (from Paradise). Mu'awiyah continued to be a polytheist, worshipping idols, until he embraced Islam very long time after the coming of the Prophet (s.a.w) and then he became arrogant in obeying Allah's appointment of Ali as the leader; everybody gave him vow of allegiance after Uthman and he sat in his position. Thus he is worse than Satan."

We say: This statement contained a lot of misguidance, ignorance, apostasy from the religion of Islam and all religions, nay from rationality that is possessed by unbelievers and which is not hidden to whoever ponder over it.

Firstly: This is because Satan is the worst unbeliever than anyone else, and whoever enters Hell-Fire is among his followers, as Allah the Most High has said: **"That I will fill Hell with you (Satan) and those of them (mankind) that follow you, together"** (38:85). He is the one who command them to all ugly things and the one who makes their actions seems good to them. Then how can anybody be eviler than him, especially among the Muslim and especially among the companions?

The Rafidi stated: "Worse than Satan, is the one who did not pass him in past obedience and he went hand in hand with him at his arena of disobedience." This Rafidi's statement entailed that whoever commit a sin is worse than Satan, because he did not pass him in his past obedience and he went hand in hand with him at his

arena of disobedience; then it means that Adam (a.s) and his descendants are worse than Satan. This is because the Prophet (s.a.w) has said that: ***“All children of Adam are sinners and the best sinners are those who repent” (Tirmidhi, Ibn Majah).***

And again, can anybody who believes in Allah and the Last Day say: Whoever commit a sin among the Muslims is worse than Satan? Is this not among the things which falsity is known necessarily from the religion of Islam? Whoever makes this statement is an unbeliever whose unbelief is known necessarily from the religion of Islam. On the basis of this (Rafidi's argument), Shia are always committing sins and therefore, each and every one of them is worse than Satan.

If the Kharijites said to them: Ali has committed sins and therefore he is more evil than Satan, the Shia Rawafid will not have any proof to defend themselves except the claim of infallibility and they cannot be able to advance a proof against the Kharijites concerning Ali's faith, his justice and his leadership let alone his infallibility. It is only Ahlus Sunnah who can be able to prove the faith of Ali (r.a), his justice and his leadership; because what Rafidah are advancing as proofs are refuted and contradicted with what is similar to them and thus argumentation with them is nullified.

If attestation is proven with what the generality of scholars believed and which is indicated in the Qur'an in the words of Allah the Most High: ***“...Thus did Adam disobey his Lord, so he went astray” (20:121).*** This (on the basis of Shia argumentation) entailed that Prophet Adam (a.s) is worse than Satan. Summarily, the exigencies of this statement have uncountable evils.

Secondly: Those words are statements without proof, nay they are self-negating falsehood. When you say: Worse than Satan is the one who did not pass him in in past obedience and he went hand in hand with him in his arena of disobedience? This is because nobody went hand in hand with Satan in all his fields of disobedience. We cannot imagine among human beings anybody who is at parity with Satan in misguiding all people and leading them astray from the right path.

Concerning the past obedience of Satan; all of it has been nullified after his unbelief; surely, apostasy nullifies all good works. Thus, whatever preceded of his obedience; if it is obedience, then it has been nullified and brought to nothing and it is in vain by his unbelief and apostasy and what he has committed of evil has no parity or semblance with anyone in it, therefore it is unattainable to anyone to be more evil than him. The similitude of this is to have an apostate, who kill people, commit illegal sexual intercourse and do all the ugly things after he has been obedient before. Thereafter, some people come after him who did not pass him in those acts of obedience that are now in vain and then associate him in a little of his sins; he cannot be worse than him. Then how can anybody be worse than Satan?

This demolish the principle of Shia belief, both its truth and falsehood; the little than can be hinged upon them is that the companions of Ali, who fought in his side, they sometimes disobeys him, therefore they are worse than those who refused to give him vow of allegiance among the companions; because those people have worshipped Allah before them and these people (party of Ali) goes hand in hand with them in the field of disobedience (thus they are worse than Satan).

Thirdly: what is your proof that Satan has been the most obedient Angel? That he has been carrying the Throne alone for six thousand years? Or he is one of those carrying the Throne? Or that there is no space on earth except that he has bowed and prostrated on it and similar things that are being said by some people? These types of things can only be known through sound reports and there is nothing like that either in the Qur'an or in a sound Sunnah from the Prophet (s.a.w). Therefore, can anyone argue with this on principle of religion other than the greatest ignorant man?

The most surprising thing is his statement: "There is no doubt among the scholars that Satan has been the greatest worshipper among the Angels." Then we ask him: Who has said that among the companions, the Tabi'un and others among the Muslims Scholars? Then what more of its being agreed upon by the scholars? This

statement has never been made by a person whose words are accepted among the Muslims scholars. This is an issue that can only be known through sound report and nobody has reported it from the Prophet (s.a.w) with neither a sound chain of authority nor a weak one. If somebody has said it among the predecessor or authors of delicate stories or some people who copies in their exegesis of the Qur'an Isra'iliyat, [\[104\]](#) which haven't got any sound chain of authority. These type of things does not prove even a basket of vegetables. Then how can they be used to prove that Satan is better than all those who have disobeyed Allah (commit some sins) among the children of Adam and made the companions those who Satan is better than them? Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) never describe Satan with any goodness nor with any past act of worship or righteous work, this, although if he has any past act of worship, then they have been destroyed, they are in vain by his unbelief and apostasy.

The more surprising thing is his word: "There is no doubt among the scholars that he has been carrying the Throne alone for six thousand years." Then, Glory be upon Allah! Has anybody said that among the scholars that are accepted by the Muslims? Can anybody make such statement other the most compound ignorant? Surely this cannot be known – and if it is true – except by reports of the Prophet (s.a.w) and there is nothing concerning that from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

We state again: Mu'awiyah's being a Muslim has been confirmed and affirmed and Islam erases and forgive whatever has been committed before it. Therefore, whoever claimed that he has become apostate after that is only making claims without proof even if the falsity of his claims is not known: Then, how about if his claims are known lies (and confirmed slander and fabrications)? And that he (Mu'awiyah) remained a Muslim until his death, the same way as others than him remained in Islam. The method by which we know that most of the Prophet's companions and others remained Muslims is the same method by which we knew that Mu'awiyah remained a Muslim. The person who is claiming that Mu'awiyah, Uthman,

Abubakar and Umar have all renounced Islam does not have a greater proof than those who are claiming that Ali has renounced Islam and if the person who is claiming that Ali has renounced Islam is telling lies, then the one who is claiming that those people have renounced Islam made clearer lies, because the belief of those people is more apparent and the ambiguities of Kharijites are more clear than the ambiguities of Shia Rafida.

We maintain that: If this claim (of Shia Rafida) is true, then it contained clear censure, disparagement, faulting and disregard to Ali, Hasan, and other people and that is because he has been defeated and overcome by apostates and Hasan handed over the affairs of Muslims to apostates. Therefore, the everlasting aid of Allah to apostates and unbelievers is greater than His aid to Ali, and Allah is Just, He cannot do injustice to anyone of them; thus he deserved His everlasting aid greater than what Ali deserved; then he is the best before Allah.

The Rafidi stated: "He was give vow of allegiance by everybody after Uthman."

We reply: If this (consensus) is not a proof, it has no benefit.^[105] If it is a proof, then their vow of allegiance to Uthman and their consensus on him are greater (than his). You (Shia) do not consider the person who refused to give vow of allegiance to Uthman as an unbeliever; nay to you he is a pious believer.

We say again: The consensus of people on giving vow of allegiance to Abubakar – in accordance to your confession – is more perfect and you people and other than you are saying: Ali refuses to give vow of allegiance for a while - in accordance to your statement. This entailed that he has disobeyed Allah concerning the appointment of Abubakar as successor to the Prophet (s.a.w); and this entailed either apostasy of Ali in accordance to your argument and proof or it is self-negation; the apostasy of Ali is false and therefore your proof is self-negated.

We say again with regard to your words: "Everybody gave him allegiance after Uthman." We reply that: This is the most apparent lie

because many Muslims: Either half or less than half or more than half did not give him vow of allegiance among whom are Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas, and Abdullah bin Umar etc.

With regard to your words: "He sat in his position." We reply that: This is a lie for right from the beginning Mu'awiyah did not seek for the Caliphate for himself and he did not travel to Iraq in order to remove Ali from leadership of the Muslims. But he and his party refused to give him vow of allegiance and he remained the governor of the province he has been administering since during the time of Umar and Uthman. When the judgment of the two judges was passed, Mu'awiyah is only the governor of Syria. Therefore, if he means by his words "he sat in his position," that he continued to administer that region alone without any say from the Caliph; then that is true. The reality is that Mu'awiyah used to say: "Surely I am not opposing him in whatever is under his control, but there is nothing that necessitate that I enter into his obedience." This statement, whether it is right or wrong does not necessarily make the one who made it worse than Satan; and whoever made the Prophet's companions worse than Satan has reached the extreme in lying against Allah, His Messenger (s.a.w) and the believers. He has also reached the extreme in aggression against the best period of Islam at this stage. Allah will aid and make victorious His Messenger and those who believe in this world and on the Day when witnesses will stand forth (for accounting).

If vain desires push man to the extreme, they will remove him from rationality, sound knowledge, and religion. We ask Allah for safety from all misfortunes. Allah will surely humiliate the people who make these types of statements and give victory to His believing slaves – among the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the rest of the Muslims – from those liars, slanderers.

SEGMENT: ON THE LEADERSHIP OF YAZID AND THE MYRTYRDOM OF HUSAIN

The Rafidi stated: "Some of them went ahead in partisanship to the extent of believing in the Imamah (leadership) of Yazid bin Mu'awiyah, although he has committed a lot of ugly acts: Killing Husain, looting his wealth, taking his women as captives, taking them round the country on horses backs that were not saddled and our master Zainul Abideen has his hands shackled. They were not satisfied with killing Husain, thus they smashed his ribs and chest with horses and carried their heads on poles. This, although their scholars have narrated that on the day Husain was killed, the sky rained blood. Rafi'i has narrated in his book titled 'Sharh al-Wajiz,' and Ibn Sa'ad mentioned it in his 'Tabaqat,' that the sky reddened in the Husain was killed and such a thing never occurred before. He also stated that: No stone was lifted in all parts of the world but it is found under it a clot of blood. The sky rained a special kind of rain, which marks remained on people's clothes for a long time until it worn out. Az-Zuhri said: Nobody remained among those who killed Husain but he was punished in this world: Either by being killed, or by becoming blind or his face is darkened or he lost his position or authority in a very short time. The Prophet (s.a.w) used to make will to the Muslims regarding his children; Hasan and Husain. He used to say: 'Those are my entrusted with you.' Allah said: **'...Say (O Muhammad): 'No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you' (42:23).'**'"

We reply as follows: With regard to his words: "Some of them went ahead in partisanship to the extent of believing in the Imamah (leadership) of Yazid bin Mu'awiyah." If he (the Rafidi) mean that they believe that he is among the rightly guided Caliphs that are guiding to the right path, such as Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali (r.a), then this is not the belief of anybody among the Muslims scholars, although some ignorant men have such beliefs; it has been narrated about some ignorant people among the Kurds etc., saying that Yazid is among the companions, some of them said he is one of

the Prophets and some of them believed that he is among the rightly guided Caliphs that guides to the right path. Those people are not among the scholars whose knowledge is transmitted; and although they are ignorant, they are still better than the ignorant Shia and the atheists among them who believed that Ali is god or a prophet or they believe that the Shari'ah (Islamic Law) has esoteric (hidden) meanings which contradicts exoteric (apparent) meanings as believed by Nusairiyyah and Ismailiyyah etc., i.e. they believed that prayer, fasting, Zakat, and pilgrimage are not obligatory upon the special (higher grade scholars) among them and they rejected the Life after death.

With regard to Ahlus Sunnah whose views are transmitted; there is nobody among them who believe that Yazid and those similar to him are among the rightly guided and leaders of guidance such as Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali. Nay, Ahlus Sunnah believed in the hadith that is related in Sunan compendiums of hadith, in which the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“The Caliphate of Prophecy will last thirty years; then Allah will give the Kingdom of His Kingdom to anyone He wills” (Abu Dawud).*** And in another version it comes with this sentence: ***“... After that it will become Kingship” (Ahmad. Tirmidhi, Ibn Hibban).*** If he (the Rafidi) means by “believing in the Imamah (leadership) of Yazid,” that they believed that he is the leader of the Muslims, their ruler at his time, and the commander of the armed forces, just like other Caliphs of Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas! Then this is a matter that is well known by everybody (as a fact) and whoever objected to it is only being arrogant, because he was given the vow of allegiance after his father thereby becoming the ruler over Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Khorasan and other parts of the Muslims countries. This is what is meant by his being an Imam (leader), successor and a ruler, just in like manner that the leader of prayer is the one who is leading people in prayer and calling such a person Imam (leader) of prayer is something natural, is seen and felt and it is not possible to reject it arrogantly. With regard to his being pious or not pious, obedient or disobedient, that is entirely another matter.

Therefore, if Ahlus Sunnah believed in the Imamah of any of these people: Yazid, or Abdulmalik or Mansur etc., it is based on this consideration and whoever disputed this is similar to those who disputed the leadership of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and those who objected to the leadership of Khosrow (of ancient Iran), Caesar, (of ancient Romans), Najashi (of ancient Ethiopia) and other kings. With regard to infallibility; nobody among the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah believe in the infallibility of any of those rulers, none of them believed that they are just in all their affairs and none of them believed that they are obedient to Allah in all their actions.

*** Furthermore, Ahlus Sunnah do not believe in the obligation of obeying leaders in whatever they command. But they believe that those people shall be supported in whatever is required of obedience to Allah... Leaders are aided in doing good and fear of Allah, but they are not aided in sin and transgression. When a leader take over power by force, such as Yazid, Abdulmalik and Mansur, there are two options: Either we say, it is necessary to remove him and fight him. And this is a bad, rotten idea because it will lead to shedding blood and killing people even if the person who rebelled is a righteous man. Rarely a man rebelled against a leader who possessed power and authority except that the result of his action is eviler than the goodness attained through such rebellion. We have examples of those who rebelled such as the people of Madina, Ibn 'Ashath who rebelled against Abdulmalik in Iraq, Ibn Muhallab who rebelled against his father in Khorasan, Abu Muslim who rebelled against Banu Umayyah and like those who rebelled in Madina and Basra. The utmost result attained by those people is that they are either defeated or they gain some victory and then their authority wane out, without much to show for it and they will not have good result at the end. Certainly, Abdullah bin Ali (al-Abbasi) and Abu Muslim killed a lot of people and both of them were killed by Abu Ja'afar al-Mansur. The people of Harra, Ibn 'Ashath and Ibn Muhallab were defeated and their companions were defeated. Thus, they did not establish religion and they did not maintain the world. Allah the Most High will not command what will not bring about

religious or worldly benefits, even if those who rebelled are righteous slaves of Allah and among the denizens of Paradise. Those people are certainly not better than Ali, Talha, Zubait and Aisha, despite that what they have committed of fighting is not praiseworthy. This is maintained, even though they are greater in the estimation of Allah and their intentions are good and better than that of other people. The same thing could be said about the people of Harra for there are among them men of religion and knowledge. The rebellion of Ibn 'Ashath also contained a lot of men of religion and knowledge. May Allah forgive all of them. Imam Sha'abi was asked concerning the rebellion of Ibn 'Ashath and he replied: "We are afflicted by Fitnah (tribulation) in which we are neither obedient, pious servant, nor strong profligates (dissents)." Hasan al-Basri used to say: "Certainly, Hajjaj bin Yusuf is a punishment of Allah, therefore, do not use your hand to repel the punishment of Allah, but you shall be humble to Allah and pray to Him for deliverance. He has certainly said: **'And indeed We seized them with punishment, but they humbled not themselves to their Lord, nor did they invoke (Allah) with submission to Him'**" (23:76). Talq bin Habib used to say: "Protect yourselves from Fitnah (tribulation) with fear of Allah!" It was said to him: "Give us a concise explanation about fear of Allah!" He replied: "That you obey Allah with light from Him, coveting His Mercy. That you abandon disobedience to Allah with light from Him, fearing His punishment" (Ahmad bin Abu Dunya).

The grand Muslims scholars used to forbid rebellion and fighting in Fitnah (civil war). Abdullah bin Umar, Sa'id bi Musayyib, Ali bin Husain Zainul Abideen and other scholars forbids rebellion in the year of Harra, when the people of Madina rebelled against Yazid. Hasan, Mujahid and other scholars used to forbid participating in the rebellion of Ibn 'Ashath. This is why the opinion of Ahlus Sunnah rested upon abandoning fighting in tribulations due to many sound, affirmed hadiths of the Prophet (s.a.w). They used to mention this opinion is their beliefs and command people to be patient to injustice of leaders and not to fight them, even though a lot of men of knowledge and religion have fought in tribulations. The issue of

fighting the rebels, commanding the good and forbidding the evil has similarity to fighting in Fitnah, but this is not the place to explain this matter.

Whoever ponder over sound hadiths that comes from the Prophet (s.a.w) on this issue and consider them with insight and understanding, will know that what they teaches is the most beneficial affairs. That is why when Husain want to go to the people of Iraq – after they have wrote to him many letters – he was advised by the best scholars endowed with knowledge and religion, such as Ibn Umar, Ibn Abbas, Abubakar bin Abdurrahman, Harith bin Hisham etc., not to go to them. They believe that he will be killed, to the extent that some of them bade him farewell saying: “I am saying good bye to the slayed.” Some of them said: “If not because of lack of decorum, I will have held you and prevent you from travelling.” They are by this giving him good advice and seeking for his benefits and the benefits of the Muslims. Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) only commanded what is beneficial and not what is harmful. The human opinion is sometimes right and sometimes it erred. Thus, it became clear that the truth is with what those men have said and advised, for his travel did not bring about any benefit, neither in religion, nor on worldly issues. Nay, the unjust, tyrants were able to kill the grandchild of the Prophet (s.a.w) unjustly. His going out and his slaying has led to many corruptions which could not have occurred, if he has stayed in his country. Certainly, nothing of what he aimed at of attaining goodness and preventing evil has materialized. Nay, evil increased by his going to Iraq and his slaying and goodness decreased thereby. It became a cause for great evil and tribulations (upto today). The murder of Husain necessitated tribulations (Fitnah), in the like manner that the murder of Uthman triggered tribulations. All these are among the things that explained what the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded of exercising patience over the injustice of leaders, abandoning fighting them and rebelling against them, is the most beneficial thing in this world and the Hereafter. It also explained that whoever disobeys those teachings intentionally or by mistake, his act will not bring about goodness and

rectitude, but evil and corruption. That is why the Messenger of Allah praised Hasan with his words: ***“Surely, this son of mine is a master, and Allah will bring about peace through him, between two great parties of Muslims.”*** The Prophet (s.a.w) never commend anybody for fighting in Fitnah, or rebelling against a leader, or revoking a vow of allegiance or abandoning the community of Muslims.

It come in sound hadiths on the authority of Ibn Umar that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“The army from My Ummah, who will first attack the city of Caesar (Constantinople) is forgiven” (Bukhari).*** The first army to fight in Constantinople is an army that was sent by Mu’awiyah under the leadership of his son Yazid and in that army there are grand companions such as Abu Ayub al-Ansari and they lay siege upon the city.

A lot of tribulations have occurred during the battles of Camel, Siffin, Harra, Murder of Husain, the battle of Mara jar-Rahit, slaying of the penitents at ‘Ainul Ward and the tribulations of Ibn ‘Ashath etc., and the greatest of all tribulations is the murder of Uthman. That is why it come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Whoever escape three things have made good his escape: My death, killing of an oppressed Caliph without right and the Anti-Christ” (Ahmad).***

Concerning the murder of Husain: There is no doubt that he was killed unjustly, a martyred, just like others similar to him who has been martyred unjustly. His murder is disobedience to Allah and His Messenger by those who killed him or aided in killing him or are pleased with his being killed. His murder is a calamity that has befallen Muslims; both his family and those who are not members of his family. Allah has accepted his martyrdom, raised his status and elevated his grade. He and his brother have acquired felicity from Allah which cannot be attained except with some types of calamities; they did not attain precedence and outstanding works as their parents because they were raised in the confines of Islam, in honor and security and they died by martyrdom; one through poisoning and the other by the blades of swords; so that they will be in the

company of those who Allah has bestowed His Grace, of the Prophets, the first and foremost believers, the martyrs and the righteous; what an excellent companions.

What has occurred of the martyrdom of Husain is not greater than killing of Prophets, for Allah has informed us that the Israelites used to kill Prophets without right. And killing of a Prophet is the greatest calamity and sin, so also the killing of Ali is the greatest sin and calamity, so also the killing of Uthman is a greater sin and calamity. If this is the case, then the obligation upon believers whenever a calamity struck are to be patient and submit everything to Allah and seek his aid through Istirja,^[106] as is love by Allah and His Messenger.

Satan innovated two innovations in relation to the martyrdom of Husain: The innovation of displaying sadness and lamentations on the day of Ashura and committing some acts such as beating the face (or parts of the body), wailing, shouting, crying, staying thirsty and reading eulogia and what that lead to of abusing the predecessors, cursing them and combining the innocent with those who commit aggression. The first and foremost Muslims are cursed and stories about his murder are read and most of those stories are lies. The intention behind instituting this innovation is to open the door of tribulation and division in the body of the Muslim community; surely committing those acts are neither obligatory nor recommended by the consensus of all Muslims. Nay, mourning, wailing and lamenting past events are among the greatest things that Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) have forbidden; the same thing about the innovation of showing happiness and being pleased (with past calamities).

What the Rafidi stated about taking his women and children as captives, going round with them in the country and carrying them on the backs of Camels without saddles are all lies, fabrications and falsehood. Muslims have never – by the Grace of Allah – taken Bani Hashim as war captive and the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) has never permitted such act, but the people of vain desires and

ignorance are telling too much lies. This is the like of what some of them are saying that: Hajjaj has killed many of Bani Hashim.

With regard to his words: "Any stone that is lifted on that day a clot of blood will be found underneath it." This is a lie.

With regard to his assertion that: "Zuhri said: There is nobody among those who killed Husain except that he has been punished in this world." We say that: This is possible because among the sins that are punished quickly by Allah is (unwarranted) aggression (against someone) and committing aggression against Husain is one of the greatest injustices.

With regard to his argument with the verse: **"...No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you." (42:23).** His argument is false and a clear lie for this verse in Chapter Forty Two of the Qur'an and it was revealed in Makka. It was revealed before Ali married Fatima and before she begets for him Hasan and Husain. Ali married Fatima in Madina in the second year after immigration, and he did not consummate his marriage with her but after the battle of Badr, which took place in the month of Ramadan of the second year. The purpose and meaning of this verse was explained by Ibn Abbas: That there isn't any clan in the tribe of Quraish except that there is between it and the Prophet (s.a.w) kinship relation and Allah said: **"...No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you." (42:23).** This means according Ibn Abbas: ***"There was no branch of the tribe of Quraish but the Prophet had relatives therein. The Prophet said, "I do not want anything from (you) except to be Kind to me for my Kinship with you" (Bukhari).*** Another version of the hadith reads: ***"There was not a single house (i.e. sub-tribe) of Quraish but had a kinship to the Prophet and so the above Verse was revealed in this connection and its interpretation is: 'O Quraish! You should keep good relation between me (i.e. Muhammad) and you" (Bukhari).*** Some authors among Ahlus Sunnah and Shia; among the students of Ahmad bin Hanbal and other people mentioned that when the verse was revealed some companions asked: "O Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) who are those

people and he replied: Ali, Fatima and her children.” This is a fabricated hadith that has been lied against the Prophet (s.a.w) by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

SEGMENT: SHIA CENSURES ON THOSE WHO ARE NOT CURSING YAZID

The Rafidi stated: "Some of those who do not believe in his leadership are not cursing him, although to them he is an unjust person by killing Husain and looting his women. Allah said: "... **No doubt, the curse of Allah is upon the wrong doers**" (11:18). Abu Faraj bin Jawzi, a scholar of the Hanbali school of jurisprudence said: Ibn Abbas said: 'Allah the Most high revealed to Muhammad (s.a.w): Surely, I avenged the murder of Yahaya bin Zakariyyah with seventy thousands souls, I will kill seventy thousand men to avenge the murder of your son.' As-Sudday, who is one of their noble scholars said: 'I stopped over at Karbala with my merchandise of staple foods. I was hosted by a man and we ate dinner with him. We talked about the martyrdom of Husain and we said: There is none of those that have participated in the murder of Husain except he died an uglier death. The man said: 'Who is a greater liar than you? I participated in fighting him and I am among those who killed him and nothing has happened to me.' At the tail end of the night, I heard an outcry. We asked: 'What has happened?' They replied: 'The man stood up repairing a lamp and his finger caught fire and after that the fire burnt all his body.' As-Sudday said: 'By Allah I saw him; he was turned into a black charcoal.'

Murna bin Yahya asked Ahmad bin Hanbal concerning Yazid. He replied: 'He is the one who has committed what he has committed.' I asked: 'What has he done?' He replied: 'He ransacked and looted Madina.' One day his son Saleh said to him: 'Some people are ascribing us to loving and supporting Yazid.' He replied: 'O my son! Can anybody who believe in Allah and the Last Day love and support Yazid?' I said: 'Don't you curse him?' He replied: 'How can I not curse the one who has been cursed by Allah in His Book!' I said: 'Which verse curse Yazid.' He replied, where Allah said: "**Would you then, if you were given the authority, do mischief in the land, and sever your ties of kinship? Such are they whom Allah has cursed, so that He has made them deaf and blinded their sight**"

(47:22-23). Can there be any mischief greater than pillaging Madina, killing its inhabitants and taking its women and children as captives? This, in addition to killing a great number of its leaders among the Quraish, Muhajirun and Ansar, to the total of about seventy. He killed between free men, slaves and women over ten thousand to the extent that people walk in blood and blood flowed to the grave of the Prophet (s.a.w) and filled the Rawdah (the area between the Prophet's pulpit and his house) and the Mosque. After all these he hit the Ka'abah with catapults thereby demolishing it and burning it down.

The Prophet said: The killer of Husain will be in a box of fire, upon him will be half of the punishment of the denizens of Fire, his hands and legs are tied with chains of fire, he will live in it and will fall into its bottom and his passed wind is the most detested thing by the denizens of Hell Fire because of its high, nauseating odor. He will live in it forever, in painful chastisements, whenever his skin burnt out a new one replaces it so that the pains are felt greatly, they will not be given respite for a moment and they will be given drinks of boiling water. Woe to them from the punishment of Allah. The Prophet said: The anger of Allah and my anger are intensified against the one who spill the blood of my family and hurt me in my progeny."

We reply: speaking about cursing Yazid is like speaking about cursing those who are similar to him among kings, Caliphs etc., and Yazid is better than others: He is better than Mukhtar bin Abi Ubaid ath-Thaqafi the governor of Iraq, who claimed that he is avenging the murder of Husain, because he claimed that Angel Gabriel descends to him (with revelations and that he is a Prophet), he is also better than Hajjaj bin Yusuf, for he is more unjust than Yazid by consensus of the people.

The greatest thing that could be said about Yazid and those similar to him of Kings is that he is a sinner and cursing a specific sinner (by mentioning his name) has not been commanded, because the Sunnah come with cursing types of disobedience such as: ***"May Allah curse the thief, he steals an egg and his hand is cut"***

(Bukhari, Muslim). He also said: ***“One who consume usury has been cursed, as well as the one who pays it, and the one who witness it and the one who records it” (Muslim, Ahmad)***. In another hadith he said: ***“Allah has cursed wine (intoxicants), the one who drink it, the one who makes it, the one who carries it, the one who it is carried to and the one who consume the money from its sale” (Abu Dawud)***. He also said: ***“May the curse of Allah be upon legalizer of marriage and the one for whose sake marriage is legalized” (Ibn Majah, Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud)***. He also said: ***“May Allah curse innovators and the one who harbors (accommodate) innovators” (Muslim)***.

*** Imam Ahmad ruled that it is detestable to curse a specific person, but one can make a general curse in a similar manner that Allah the Most high said: ***“The curse of Allah is on the wrongdoers” (11:18)***. It come in sound hadith that a man that is called Khammar used to drink wine and they used to bring him to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) who applies the legal punishment on him. A man said: “May Allah curse you! How often you are being brought!” The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Do not curse him, for surely he loves Allah and His Messenger” (Bukhari)***. Thus, the Prophet forbids cursing this specific person although he has generally cursed those who drink wine. It is well-known that every Muslim necessarily loves Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) except if he is a hypocrite and such a person is far away from the Mercy of Allah. Those who permitted cursing a specific person say: I will curse him and pray for him, for he deserved punishment and thus, he will be cursed and he deserved recompense from the consideration that he is a Muslim and thus, he deserved to be prayed for. And this is the opinion of the Prophet’s companions, the Ahlus Sunnah, Karmiyyah, Murji’ah and the opinion of many among the Shia who are saying a profligate (Fasiq) cannot remain in Hell-Fire forever. The Kharijites, the Mu’atazilites and some Shia says that a profligate will remain in Hell-Fire forever. But all these groups agreed upon that he will not remain in Fire forever if he repented.

It is now upon those who are cursing Yazid and people like him to prove that he is an unjust, profligate, that cursing a specific profligate is allowed and that Yazid died without repenting from the sin he has committed. Furthermore, the necessity of punishment can be removed due to contrast, good cause that overweigh (the sin committed), such as good righteous deed that erase and remove bad deeds and tribulations by which Allah forgives His slaves. Allah said: **“Verily, Allah forgives not that partners should be set up with him in worship, but He forgives except that (anything else) to whom He pleases, and whoever sets up partners with Allah in worship, he has indeed invented a tremendous sin” (4:48).** It come in sound hadith that the first army to wage Jihad in Constantinople is forgiven and the first army that fought that city was under the command of Yazid. We knew that most of the Muslims have committed (some types of) injustice and if this door is open most of the past Muslims will be cursed, but Allah has commanded that supplications for forgiveness shall be made for the past Muslims. Abusing those who are dead is greater than abusing those who are alive. The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Don't abuse the dead, because they have reached the result of what they forwarded” (Bukhari).*** What is soundly reported from Imam Ahmad by his son Saleh is that he said: “When did you ever see your father cursing anyone?” The narrations that Imam Ahmad permits cursing specific person is not sound for its chain of authority is disjointed. The words of Allah the Most High: **“Such are they whom Allah has cursed, so that He has made them deaf and blinded their sight” (47:23),** does not indicate cursing specific person. If cursing specific person who commits a type of sin is permitted, most of the people will be cursed. Generally, cursing is like a form of general threat and warning, which affirming on a specific person is not necessary except if its exigencies and necessities are found and its hindrances are negated. This is said, under the assumption that Yazid has committed what will break the bond kinship relation. Certainly, cutting the tie of kinship has been committed by many among the Banu Hashim who have fought among themselves – among the Banu

Abbas and Talibiyun (descendants of Abu Talib). Can all those people be cursed?

With regard to what he (Yazid) did to the people of Harra^[107]: When the people of Madina revoked their allegiance to him, expelled his governor and his relatives. He sent to them again and again asking them to obey his authority, but they refused. He sent to them Muslim bin 'Aqba al-Murri and commanded him that if he get victory over them, he shall pillage the city for three days; and this is the greatest thing that people objected against Yazid and this is why Ahmad bin Hanbal was asked: "Do you write hadith reported by Yazid? He replied: No and there is no honor in that, he is the one who did with the people of Madina what he did." But he did not kill all the noble men (as claimed by the Rafidi), those killed are not up to ten thousand men, blood did not flow to the grave of the Prophet (s.a.w); it did not reach the Rawdah and the fight did not occur in the mosque.

With regard to the Ka'abah: Everybody knows that Allah has honored it, exalted it and made it a sanctuary of peace and therefore, Allah never allow anybody to desecrate it, neither in Islam nor before Islam. Nay, when the owners of the Elephants aimed at violating its sanctuary, Allah punished them with the well-known punishment. The rulers of Muslims among the Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas and there representatives (governors and army commanders) never aimed at violating the Ka'abah's sanctity; neither the representative of Yazid nor the representatives of Abdulmalik, and neither Hajjaj bin Yusuf nor anyone else. All Muslims respect the Ka'abah and honor it; but what they aimed at is blockade and siege of Abdullah bin Zubair and the shootings with catapults are aimed at him and not at the Ka'abah. After they have killed Ibn Zubair, they entered the Mosque and circumambulated the Ka'abah and Hajjaj bin Yusuf led people in the performance of the pilgrimage that year. Caliph Abdulmalik bin Marwan commanded him not to disagree with Ibn Umar with regard to rituals of the pilgrimage. If their aim is to commit evil against the Ka'abah they would have

done so after it comes under their control in the manner that they killed Ibn Zubair after they have overpowered him.

With regard to the hadith he has stated that: "The killers of Husain are in a box of fire..." Then, know that this is one of the hadiths of liars and fabricators, who have no shame in rushing to tell lies against the Prophet (s.a.w). Can anybody, - he alone - be given half of the punishments of the denizens of Hell Fire? Or be apportioned with half of the punishment of those in Hell? Where is the punishment of the people of Pharaoh, the hypocrites and the rest of the unbelievers? Where are the killers of the Prophets and the killers of the first and the foremost to embrace Islam?

The killers of Uthman have committed greater sin than the killers of Husain and this extra extremism of Shia Rafida is checked with the extremism of Nawasib who are claiming that Husain has been a Kharijite and that his killing is permissible due to what the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"Whosoever comes to you while your affairs has been united under one man, intending to break your strength or dissolve your unity, kill him"* (Muslim).**

Ahlu Sunnah and Jama'ah advances replies to both the Shia Rafida and the Nawasib and they are saying: Surely Husain has been killed unjustly, a martyred and that those who killed him are unjust aggressors. The hadith which the Prophet commanded that the one who rebelled against the community shall be killed is not applicable to him, because he did not rebelled against the community and he was killed demanding to be allowed to go back to his country or a frontier or to Yazid. Thus, he is within the community and completely shunning to divide it. If a man lesser than his status has made those requests it is imperative to accept his requests. Then why shall it not be obligatory to accept Husain's request? If a person requesting for such matters is less than Husain, neither his imprisonment nor taking hold of him is permissible, not to speak about his capture and murder.

With regard to his words: The prophet said: "The anger of Allah and my anger are intensified against the one who spill the blood of my

family and hurt me in my progeny.” This statement is not reported from the Prophet (s.a.w) and no one can ascribe it to him except the ignorant. This is because the protection of the blood of Husain and other than him by faith and fear of Allah is greater than mere tie of kinship. If a person is of the family of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he committed what permitted killing him or cutting (his hand) him; that is allowed by the consensus of Muslims. It has been reported from the Prophet (s.a.w), in a sound hadith that he said: ***“The nations prior to you were destroyed because if a noble amongst them stole, they used to excuse him, and if a poor person amongst them stole, they would apply (Allah's) Legal Punishment to him. By Him in Whose Hand Muhammad's soul is, if Fatima, the daughter of Muhammad stole, I would cut her hand” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** So if a man from Bani Hashim commit illegal sexual intercourse and he is married, he will be stoned to death by the consensus of Muslims scholars and if he killed another person, even if the victim is from Habasha (Ethiopia) or Rome or Turks or Dulaim, he will also be killed. This is because the Prophet (s.a.w) has said: ***“Muslims are equal in respect of blood. The lowest of them is entitled to give protection on behalf of them, and the one residing far away may give protection on behalf of them” (Ahmad, Abu Dawud, Ibn Majah).*** Thus, he has said that the most dear person to him among his family will have the law applied upon him if he violated it.

Therefore, the blood of Bani Hashim and none Bani Hashim are equal, if they are free Muslims, by the consensus of the Islamic community; there is no any difference between shedding the blood of Bani Hashim and a none Bani Hashim if it is done by right. Thus, how can the Prophet specify his family with mention; that the anger of Allah will be intense on whoever shed their blood? Allah has forbidden killing of life except by right and if a person is killed by right; why shall the anger of Allah descend on the one who killed him, whether he is Bani Hashim or not Bani Hashim? If he is killed without right; then whoever killed a believer intentionally his recompense is Fire abiding therein forever as has been explained by

the Qur'an: **“And whoever kills a believer intentionally, his recompense is Hell to abide therein, and the Wrath and the Curse of Allah are upon him, and a great punishment is prepared for him” (4:93).**

Therefore, the things that protect life and the ones that permit its shedding are not associated with Bani Hashim or none Bani Hashim. Thus, this type of statement cannot be ascribed to the Prophet (s.a.w) except by a hypocrite who is trying to find faults in his Prophethood or an ignorant person who does not know the justice with which the Prophet was sent.

With regard to his words in which he stated that, the Prophet said: “Whoever harms me in my progeny...” We reply: Surely harming the Prophet (s.a.w) in his progeny, his community and his Sunnah etc., is forbidden.

SEGMENT: ON THAT THE CREED OF SHIA RAFIDA IS THE CONFLUENCE OF MISGUDANCE

The Rafidi stated: "Therefore, let the person with intellect asses, which of the two groups more deserved security. Is it the group that purified Allah, His Angels, His Prophets and His Imams; and purify the Shari'ah from ugly issues or the one which nullify its prayers by refusing to supplicate for blessings to the leaders that Allah has chosen for them and by supplicating for blessings to other Imams. Are these people better or those who maintain and remain with the Imams (leaders) that Allah has chosen for them?"

We reply as follows: What you mentioned of purifications are nothing but negation and lessening of the rights of Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w) that is because the words of Jahmiyyah - and Shia Rafida – who negates Allah's attributes entailed describing Him by nullifying His perfect characteristics and thereby making Him similar to none living things and the none existent. If they say: He does not possess life, knowledge, speech, will, ability, love, anger, acceptance (being pleased with), He cannot be seen (in the Hereafter), He does not do anything by himself and He cannot be able to deal with things by himself; then they have made him similar to the defective, none living things; they have taken away from Him all attributes of perfection and this is nothing but negation and lessening and not purification.

What is meant by purification is to free Him from all defects that negates the attributes of perfection. Thus, you purify Him above death, slumber, sleep, inability, ignorance, need etc., the way He has purified Himself in His Book; so it is joined for Allah the Most High all attributes of perfection and negation of all defective attributes that negates perfection; and then He is elevated and purified in His attributes of perfection from having anything similar to Him.

With regard to the Prophets, you (Shia Rafida) you have negated from them what Allah Has bestowed upon them of perfection and higher position by the reality of repentance and seeking for forgiveness and moving from perfection to what is more perfect than

it. You disbelieved what Allah has informed about that in His Book and you altered the words from their real meaning. You think that for a son of Adam to move from state of ignorance to knowledge, from misguidance to guidance and from being astray to being on the right path entailed that he is defective. You did not know that these are the greatest blessings of Allah and His Will whereby His slaves move from imperfection to perfection and the person who tested evil and good come to understand them and he might love what is good and hate what is evil greater than the person who knows only good and he did not know evil. Umar (r.a) said: ***“The bonds of Islam will be undone one by one when there will be a generation brought up in Islam who do not know what Jahiliyah (ignorance) is”.***

With regard to the claimed (Rafida) purification and absolving the Imams from defects; these are nothing but disrepute, scandalous and shameful acts that we feel ashamed to mention, especially the (belief in) none existent Imam from who neither religious nor worldly benefits are attained.[\[108\]](#)

In respect of purifying the Shari’ah from ugly things; we have already mentioned that Ahlus Sunnah never agree on any ugly issue in contrast to Shia Rafida, for they have many ugly issues that are not found in any group other than them.

With regard to his words: “They (Ahlus Sunnah) nullify their prayers by refusing to supplicate for blessings to the leaders that Allah has chosen for them and by supplicating for blessings to other Imams.” We reply thus: If you mean that, it is compulsory to supplicate for the twelve Imams or to one specific person other than the Prophet (s.a.w) from among them or from other than them or you mean the obligation of praying for the family of Muhammad (s.a.w). If you mean the first, then this is one of the greatest misguidance and going out of the bounds of the laws of Muhammad (s.a.w); for we and they know out of necessity that the Prophet (s.a.w) did not command anyone to supplicate for the twelve Imams; neither in prayer nor in any other issue. Nobody among the Muslims have done something like that during his life time, nobody has reported that from the Prophet (s.a.w), neither with sound chain of authority

nor with a week one and it is not compulsory for anyone during his life time to take any of the Twelve Imams as his leader let alone making it compulsory to supplicate for them in prayers.

The prayers of Muslims during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) are sound and this is known out of necessity and by consensus. Therefore, whoever made supplicating for those people in prayer compulsory and void the prayer in which supplication has not been made for them, has surely changed the religion of Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) and altered it, the way Jews and Christians changed and altered the religions of the Prophets.

If it said that, what is meant is to supplicate for the family of Muhammad (s.a.w) and they are part of them.^[109] We reply that: The family of Muhammad (s.a.w) encompassed Bani Hashim, his wives and Bani Abdulmutallab and Shia Imamiyyah are censuring and disparaging most of those people; they are censuring the children of Abbas and especially their Caliphs and they are part of the family of Muhammad (s.a.w). They are censuring those who love and support Abubakar and Umar and the generality of Bani Hashim love and supports Abubakar and Umar and they do not absolve themselves from them; all the scholars and religious men of Bani Hashim love and supports Abubakar and Umar.^[110]

*** When the Prophet was asked on how to supplicate to him he replied: ***“O Allah, send Your salah (grace, honor and mercy) upon Muhammad and upon his wives and offspring, as You sent Your salah upon Ibrahim, and send Your blessings upon Muhammad and upon his wives and offspring, as You sent Your blessings upon the family of Ibrahim. You are indeed Praiseworthy, Most Glorious.”*** (Bukhari, Muslim). Muslims have consensus that the family of Abbas, the family of Harith bin Abdulmutallaib (and the family of ‘Aqil) are among the household of the Prophet (s.a.w) upon whom receiving and consuming Zakat is forbidden. Some adherents of Malikiyyah and Hanbaliyyah schools of jurisprudence believe that the family of Muhammad (s.a.w) is his community and nation. Groups among the ascetics believe that the

family of Muhammad (s.a.w) is the pious slaves of Allah in his community. Furthermore, the majority of the jurists do not obligate supplicating for the Prophet (s.a.w) and his family in prayer and those who made it a general obligation do not allow confining it and restricting it to some members of his family. Again, nullifying prayer due to supplication made for a particular Caliph (or a number of specific Caliphs), is a false statement. If a devotee supplicated for or against a particular person, his prayer is not null in accordance to the opinion of most of the scholars. Certainly, the Prophet (s.a.w) made Qunut supplications against some specific people and he curse other by their names.

It is surprising that those Rafida are claiming elevation and exaltation of the family of Muhammad (s.a.w) and at the same time they planned and executed the coming of Tartars, the unbelievers to Bagdad, the capital of the Caliphate. And those unbeliever killed uncountable Muslims among who are Bani Hashim and other groups; they killed in all fronts of Bagdad over 1,970,000 people, they also killed the Abbasid Caliph and took as war captives the women of Bani Hashim and their children. Undoubtedly, this is hatred against the family of Muhammad (s.a.w) and that is what unbelievers have done with the aid of Shia Rafida; they are the people who took the women and children of Bani Hashim to Yazid and other rulers as war captives. So, there is nothing that they faulted in other people as defect except that a greater defect is found in them and with them.

SEGMENT: PROOFS TO PROVE THE DIVINE APPOINTMENT OF ALI AS THE LEADER (IMAM)

The Rafidi stated: “When Shia Imamiyyah saw uncountable virtues of Ali and his perfections that have been reported by both the opposition and the supporters. Their generality also saw that a lot of disparaging remarks have been reported with regard to other companions in contrast to Ali in whose account no disparagement has ever been reported and they took him as their Imam (leader); since both the opposition and supports have purified him. Thus, they abandoned other than him, because even those who believed in his leadership have reported disparaging remarks concerning him and his leadership. In this study we will mention a little of what is sound in their books, which they have taken from their reliable books and statements, so that it will be proofs against them on the Day of Resurrection.

Among those narrations is what has been reported by Abul Hasan al-Andulisi in his book titled ‘al-Jam’u bainal Sihah as-Sittah,’ – Muwatta of Imam Malik, Bukhari, Muslim, Sunan Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi and Nisai’i – on the authority of Umm Salma (r.a), wife of the Prophet (s.a.w) that the words of Allah: ‘**...Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet), and to purify you with a thorough purification’ (33:33)**, was revealed in her house while she is seated before the door and she said: O Messenger of Allah; am I not among your family? He replied: You are you in goodness; you are among the wives of the Prophet (s.a.w). She said: And in the house there are with the Prophet (s.a.w) Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain and he placed them under a garment and said: O Allah! Those are members of my family; remove from them evil deeds and cleanse them thoroughly.”

We reply as follows: The sound Sunnah on the virtues of Abubakar and Umar are greater than the reported sound virtues of Ali. The hadiths that he has mentioned, claiming that they are sound in

accordance to the generality (Ahlus Sunnah)^[111] of scholars and that they have mentioned them in their reliable books and statements are very clear lie against the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah. Surely, most of those hadiths that he has mentioned are either lies or weak by the consensus of scholars of hadith and the ones that are sound among them has nothing in it that indicate the leadership of Ali or his being better than Abubakar and Umar, nay they are not exclusive or limited to him alone, but they are virtues which he shared with other people, in contrast to Abubakar and Umar, for a lot of their virtues are limited to them and especially the virtues of Abubakar for most of it are exclusive traits to him, which he did not share with anybody.

With regard to what he mentioned of censures and disparagements; it is not possible to face the three Caliphs with any criticism except that Ali is faced with something similar to it or greater than it. This explained to you that what he has mentioned about this issue are of the greatest falsehood and we will explain that in details.

With regard to what the Rafidi stated: “They have undoubtedly made him their Imam, since both the opposition and supporters have absolved him from blemish and they have abandoned other than him, because even the person who believed in his leadership have narrated reports that criticized his leadership.”

We reply that: This is a clear lie, for undoubtedly, the opposition did not absolve Ali from blemish. Nay, those who are disparaging Ali are many groups and sects and those groups and sects are better than those who are disparaging Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman. Nay, those who disparaged Ali are better than those who exaggerated in him and became extremists in him. This is because the Kharijites who have agreed upon excommunicating him from Islam are to the assessment of all Muslims; better than the Shia extremists who believed that he is god, or a prophet (or better than a Prophet – and those who fought him among the companions and the Tabi’un are better in the estimation of all the Muslims scholars than Shia Rafida (Ithna Ashariyyah) who believed that he is an infallible leader (and better than all Prophets and Messengers of Allah and they gave him attributes of Allah –see footnote number 108).

Nobody in the Islamic community disparage `Abubakar, Umar and Uthman except Shia Rafida. The Kharijites that are excommunicating Ali from Islam loves and support Abubakar and Umar and supplicates to Allah to be pleased with them. The Marwaniyyah sect, who are ascribing Ali to injustice are saying that he is not a Caliph and they loves and support Abubakar although they are not related by blood relationship. With all these; how can anybody say Ali has been absolved from blame by both the opponents and the supporters in contrast to the three Caliphs?

It is well known that absolving those three from all blames and censure is greater and better and that those who are disparaging Ali – to the extent of ascribing him to unbelief, disobedience and profligacy – are known groups and sects and they are more learned and more religious than Rafida. The Shia Rafida are weak before them in scholarship and strength and therefore, they cannot be able to disprove them with a cogent proof and if they face them in war, they defeat them.

Those groups that disparage Ali and called him unbeliever and unjust are not known to renounce Islam, in contrast to the groups that are praising him and disparaging the three Caliphs, like those Shia extremists who are claiming that he is god, such as Nusairiyyah and others and like Isma'iliyyah the atheists who are eviler than Nusairiyyah and like the extremist who are claiming that he is a prophet (or better than all the Prophets and Messenger of Allah – all these evils are found in Shia Rafida, Ithna Ashariyyah – see footnote number 108);^[112] surely those are unbelievers, apostates and their disbelief in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) is very clear and cannot be hidden to anyone who has knowledge of Islam. Whoever believe that a human being is god (or possess attributes of Allah) or believed that there is a prophet after Muhammad (s.a.w) or that he is not the Prophet and that the real prophet is Ali, for it is just that Angel Gabriel has made mistake (by taking the message to Muhammad); all these statements and those similar to them clearly shows the unbelief of those who made them to whoever has limited knowledge of the religion of Islam. This is in contrast to those who

excommunicated Ali from Islam or curse him among the Kharijites (and the Nawasib) and those who fought him and curse him among the companions of Mu'awiyah and the Bani Marwan and other groups, for those groups believe in Islam and its laws: They observed prayers, give out Zakat, fast in the month of Ramadan, perform the pilgrimage to the House of Allah and they made forbidden what Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) has disallowed. Thus, there is no apparent unbelief among them, nay the laws of Islam and its rituals are honored and performed by them; these are facts that are known to whoever knows the condition of Islam and Muslims. Therefore, how can this Rafidi claim that all those who opposed him (Imam Ali) have absolved him from blames and defects in contrast to the three Caliphs?

SEGMENT: HADITH OF THE GARMENT DOES NOT PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

With regard to the hadith of the garment which has been mentioned by the Rafidi! The ones that are sound have been recorded by Ahmad and Tirmidhi on the authority of Umm Salma (r.a) and Muslim has recorded it on the authority of **Aisha (r.a): “That Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) went out one morning wearing a striped cloak of the black camel's hair that there came Hasan b. 'Ali. He wrapped him under it, then came Husain and he wrapped him under it along with the other one (Hasan). Then came Fatima and he took her under it, then came 'Ali and he also took him under it and then said: Allah only desires to take away any uncleanness from you, O people of the household, and purify you (thorough purifying)(Muslim).** Fatima, Hasan and Husain have shared Ali in this hadith or virtue and thus, it is not exclusive to him and it is well known that a woman is not suitable to be a Caliph and therefore, this virtue is not exclusive to leaders, nay other people have shared this virtue with him.

And then, the meaning of this hadith is that the Prophet (s.a.w) supplicated for them and asked Allah to cleans them a through cleansing and the extreme limit of that is he has prayed for them to be among the pious who Allah has cleaned and purified from evils. It is compulsory upon all believers to avoid evils, uncleanness and abominations and cleansing and purifying oneself is the command of Allah the Most High upon all believers. Allah the Exalted said: **“O you who believe! When you intend to offer As-Salat (the prayer), wash your faces and your hands (forearms) up to the elbows, rub (by passing wet hands over) your heads, and (wash) your feet up to ankles. If you are in a state of Janaba (i.e. had a sexual discharge), purify yourself (bathe your whole body). But if you are ill or on a journey or any of you comes from answering the call of nature, or you have been in contact with women (i.e. sexual intercourse) and you find no water, then perform Tayammum with clean earth and rub therewith your**

faces and hands. Allah does not want to place you in difficulty, but He wants to purify you, and to complete His Favour on you that you may be thankful (5:6). And Allah said: “... Truly, Allah loves those who turn unto Him in repentance and loves those who purify” (2:222). And Allah the Most Sublime said: “Take Sadaqah (alms) from their wealth in order to purify them and sanctify them with it, and invoke Allah for them. Verily! Your invocations are a source of security for them, and Allah is All-Hearer, All-Knower” (9:103).

Therefore, the extreme limit and goal of that is that he has supplicated for them to Allah to aid them in acting upon what they are commanded to do and to shun what they are prohibited from doing. With regard to Abubakar as-Siddiq, Allah has said concerning him: “**And the pious will be far removed from it (Hell). He who spends his wealth for increase in self-purification, And have in his mind no favour from anyone for which a reward is expected in return, Except only the desire to seek the Countenance of his Lord, the Most High; He surely will be pleased (when he will enter Paradise)**” (92:17-22). Again, Allah said: “**And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun (those who migrated from Makkah to Al-Madinah) and the Ansar (the citizens of Al-Madinah who helped and gave aid to the Muhajirun) and also those who followed them exactly (in Faith). Allah is well-pleased with them as they are well-pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow (Paradise), to dwell therein forever. That is the supreme success**” (9:100). Thus, the first and foremost to embrace Islam must have done what they are commanded and shun what they are forbidden for them to have reached the stage of being pleased by Allah. This is because their being pleased by Allah and the promised recompense can only be attained by doing that, and cleansing them from sins are some of their virtues, attributes and characteristics. What the Prophet (s.a.w) has supplicated for the people of the garment is what Allah has described the first and foremost to embrace Islam with as some of their characteristics.

The Prophet (s.a.w) has also prayed for other than the people of the garment for blessings of Allah; he prayed for Allah's forgiveness and Paradise for many people with what is greater than that. Again, it does not entail that those who have benefitted from that supplication are better than the first and foremost to embrace Islam (of the Muhajirun and Ansar).

Since the people of the garment have been commanded by Allah to shun abomination and purify themselves, the Prophet (s.a.w) supplicated to Allah to aid them in acting upon what they have been commanded to do; so that they do not deserve His censure, threats and punishment and so that they attain praises, pleasure of their Lord, and recompense (High grades in Paradise).

SEGMENT: ON THE VERSE OF GIVING CHARITY BEFORE CONSULTING THE PROPHET IN PRIVATE

The Rafidi stated: “Allah said: ‘**O you who believe! When you (want to) consult the Messenger (Muhammad SAW) in private, spend something in charity before your private consultation. That will be better and purer for you. But if you find not (the means for it), then verily, Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful’ (58:12).** Ali said: ‘Nobody acted upon this verse except me and because of me Allah lessened its obligation.’”

We reply: The command to give out charity is not compulsory on the Muslims and thus, they cannot be considered sinners for not doing so. Allah commanded that charity shall be given (to the poor) by the person who wants to consult the Prophet (s.a.w) in private and it happened that nobody wants to have private consultation with him (at that time) except Ali and he gave out charity for that purpose. This verse is similar to the command of Allah the Most High that, whoever is prevented from completing the pilgrimage and the lesser pilgrimage shall offer a sacrifice. It is also like His command to whoever performs lesser pilgrimage in the month of Zulhijjah (12th month of the Islamic calendar) before performing the pilgrimage to offer sacrifice and like His command that whoever makes a vow he can revoke it by giving out charity.

SEGMENT: THE VERSE OF PROVIDING WATER FOR THE PILGRIMES DOES NOT PROVE IMAMAH OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “From Muhammad bin Ka’ab al-Qurzi who said: Talha bin Shaibah from Bani Abdur-Dar, Abbas bin Abdulmutallib and Ali bin Abi Talib boasted before each other. Talha bin Shaibah said: ‘With me are the keys of the House of Allah, if I like I can sleep inside it.’ Abbas said: ‘I am the one who provide drinking water to the pilgrims and I am responsible for it. If I like I can sleep in the mosque.’ Ali said: ‘I do not know what you people are saying; I prayed towards the Qiblah (direction of prayer) for six months before others do so, and I am the prince of Jihad.’ Then Allah revealed: **‘Do you consider the providing of drinking water to the pilgrims and the maintenance of Al-Masjid-al-Haram (at Makkah) as equal to the worth of those who believe in Allah and the Last Day, and strive hard and fight in the Cause of Allah? They are not equal before Allah. And Allah guides not those people who are the Zalimun (polytheists and wrong-doers)’**” (9:19).

We reply as follows: This statement cannot be found in all reliable books of hadith, nay the signs of fabrications and lies are very clear on it, among which are: There is nobody called Talha among the custodians of the Ka’abah, the custodian of the Ka’abah is called Shaibah bin Uthman bin Talha. This is one of the things that showed to you that the hadith is not sound. Then, there is in it the statement of Abbas: “If I like I can sleep in the mosque.” What is a big issue about sleeping in the mosque, so that he can boast about it? Thereafter, comes the statement of Ali: “I prayed to the Qiblah for six months before others do so.” This is known to be false out of necessity in the religion of Islam; for between his embracing Islam and the acceptance of Islam by Zaid, Abubakar and Khadijah there is only one day or something similar to that. Then how can he pray for six months before the others do so? And again, he cannot say: “I am the prince of Jihad,” for a great number of people have participated in Jihad, just like he does!

SEGMENT: ON THAT THE HADITH OF THE LEGATEE IS FABRICATED LIE

The Rafidi stated: “Among that is what Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded from Anas bin Malik. He said, we said to Salman: ‘Ask the Prophet (s.a.w), who is his legatee.’ Salman said to him: ‘O Messenger of Allah! Who is your legatee?’ He replied: ‘O Salman! Who is the legatee of Moses?’ I replied: ‘Yusha’u bin Nun.’ He said: ‘Surely my legatee and my heir, who will repay my debt and execute my promises is Ali bin Abi Talib.’”^[113]

We reply: This hadith is a lie and a fabrication against the Prophet (s.a.w) by the consensus of scholars of hadith and it is not in the Musnad of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal. Imam Ahmad has written a book on the virtues of the companions and he mentioned therein the virtues of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali, in addition to that of a number of the companions and he wrote therein the sound, the weak and the fabricated so that people will know them. Thus, not everything he recorded is sound. Also, there are additions made in that book by al-Qutai'i which he collected from his scholars and those additions are mostly lies – we will mention some of it by the Will of Allah. Scholars of al-Qutai'i are reporting from men who are of the same generation with Ahmad. Those Rafida are ignorant men, for if they see a hadith, they think that Ahmad recorded it while the recorder is in reality al-Qutai'i and he is reporting from his scholars who are of the generation of Imam Ahmad. Abdullah the son of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal has also made a lot of additions in the Musnad, especially in the Musnad of Ali bin Abi Talib.

SEGMENT: MENTIONING THE EPISODE IN WHICH THE PROPHET CARRIED ALI ON HIS SHOULDERS

The Rafidi stated: “From Zaid bin Abi Maryam who said: Ali said: We went to the Ka’abah, I and the Prophet (s.a.w). The Prophet (s.a.w) asked me to sit down and he rode my shoulders. I tried to stand up with him and he saw weakness in me. He come down and sat on the ground, and I mounted his shoulders, and he stood up with me. I thought as if I can reach the sky’s horizon, until I mounted the Ka’abah. I saw on top of it an idol of either brass or bronze. I started drawing it left and right and forward towards me until I was able to take hold of it. The Prophet (s.a.w) said to me throw it down. I threw it and it broke into pieces the way earthenware break. Then I came down. We moved away quickly until we are hidden between houses fearing that somebody will meet us.”

We reply that: If this hadith is sound there is nothing in it showing exclusive characters of a leader or exclusive traits of Ali, because the Prophet used to pray carrying Umamah the daughter of Abil ‘As bin Rabi’ah on his shoulder. If he stood up he will take her and when he prostrated he will place her on the ground. Sometimes while he is in prostration position Hasan will come and mount his back, and he will say: ***“My son has mounted me” (Nisa’i, Ahmad)***. So, if he used to carry a female child and male child, there is nothing in carrying Ali which will show that that is an exclusive trait to him. Nay, other people have shared that virtue with him and he was only carried, because he is unable to carry the Prophet (s.a.w), the way he was carried on the day of the battle of Uhud by some of the companions such as Talha bin ‘Ubaidullah. Carrying the Prophet (s.a.w) that day has benefitted him and Ali benefitted from the Prophet (s.a.w). It is well known that the person who benefitted the Prophet with his wealth and his person is greater than the one who benefitted from the person of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his wealth.

SEGMENT: THE HADITH OF THREE TRUTHFUL MEN DO NOT EVINCE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "From Ibn Abi Laila who said: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: There are three truthful men: Habib Najjar, the believer of Ali-Yasin, Huzqil the believer of Ali-Fira'un (family of Pharaoh) and Ali bin Abi Talib who is the best of them."

We reply: This is a lie against the Prophet (s.a.w) for it has been reported in sound hadiths that he called Abubakar as a truthful man. In a hadith that has been reported by Ibn Mas'ud, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"Verily, truthfulness leads to righteousness and righteousness leads to Paradise. A man may speak the truth until he is recorded with Allah as truthful. Verily, falsehood leads to wickedness and wickedness leads to the Hellfire. A man may tell lies until he is recorded with Allah as a liar."*(Muslim)**. This attested that there are many truthful people. And again, Allah the Most High informed us that Maryam (Mary) the daughter of Imran is a truthful woman. The Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning her: ***"Many amongst men reached (the level of) perfection but none amongst the women reached this level except Asia, Pharaoh's wife, and Mary, the daughter of 'Imran"*(Muslim, Bukhari)**. Therefore, the truthful among men are many.

SEGMENT: WORDS OF THE PROPHET TO ALI 'I AM FROM YOU AND YOU ARE FROM ME DOES NOT EVINCE LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: "The Prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali: ***'You are from me and I am from you.'***"

We reply thus: This hadith has been recorded in Bukhari and Muslim as reported by Barra'u bin 'Azib (r.a), when Ali, Ja'afar and Zaid differed concerning the daughter of Hamza. He ruled that she shall be in the custody of her aunt, she was before then under the custody of Ja'afar: ***"He then said to 'Ali, "You are from me, and I am from you," and said to Ja'afar, "You resemble me in appearance and character," and said to Zaid, "You are our brother and our freed slave."(Bukhari).***

The prophet (s.a.w) has used this (same) sentence to address a number of his companions as it was reported in a sound hadith from Abu Musa al-Ash'ariy that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"When the Ash'arites run short of provisions in the campaigns or run short of food for their children in Medina they collect whatever is with them in the cloth and then partake equally from one vessel. They are from me and I am from them"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). The Prophet (s.a.w) also used the same sentence for Julaibib (r.a) as is seen in the following hadith: ***"Abu Barza reported that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) was there in a battlefield that Allah conferred upon him the spoils of war. He said to his Companions: Is anyone missing amongst you? They said: So and so and so. He again said: Is there anyone missing amongst you? They said: So and so and so. He then said: Is there anyone missing amongst you? They said: No. Thereupon he (the Holy Prophet) said: But I am missing Julaibib. They (his Companions) searched him amongst those who had been killed and they found him by the side of seven (dead bodies) whom he had killed and he had been killed (by the opponents). Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) came there and stood (by his***

side) and said: He killed seven (persons). Then (his opponents) killed him. He is mine and I am his. He then placed him upon his hands and there was none else to lift but Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him). Then the grave was dug for him and he was placed in the grave and no mention is made of a bath" (Muslim). This explained to you that his words to Ali: ***"You are of me and I am of you,"*** is not exclusive to him, nay he has used the same sentence to address the Ash'arites and Julaibib. Thus, it is not a specific, exclusive trait to Ali for other people have shared this virtue with him; although they are not the three Caliphs, it neither indicated precedence nor leadership (Imamah).

SEGMENT: ARGUMENTS OF RAFIDI WITH HADITH OF 'AMR BIN MAIMOUN AND ITS EXPLANATION

The Rafidi stated: "From 'Amr bin Maimoun who said: Ali bin Abi Talib has ten virtues that are specific to him alone. The Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: 'I will appoint a man who Allah will never disgrace, he loves Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger love him.' Everybody covet to be appointed. He said: 'Where is Ali bin Abi Talib?' They replied: 'He is suffering from eyes sore and he is in the mill grinding.' When Ali arrived, the Prophet blew in his eyes and he became well. He then shook the flag three times and gave it to him. He said he sent Abubakar with the Chapter on Repentance and then he sent Ali after him to take it from him. He said, 'nobody can convey it except a man who is from me and I am from him.' He said to his relative, 'who will support me in this world and the Hereafter?' They refused and Ali said: 'I will support you in this world and the Hereafter.' He ignored him and faces them one by one and said: 'Who will support me in this world and the Hereafter?' They refused. Ali said: 'I will support you in this world and the Hereafter.' He said: 'You are my supporter in this world and the Hereafter.'

He said: Ali is the first person to embrace Islam after Khadija. He said the Prophet took his garment and placed it upon Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain and then said: "... **Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification**" (33:33). He said Ali sold himself, wore the cloth of the Prophet (s.a.w) and slept on his bed and the polytheists are throwing stones at him.

The Prophet (s.a.w) went out with people for the battle of Tabuk and Ali said to him: 'I am going with you?' He replied: 'No.' Ali wept. The Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: 'Are you not pleased to be unto me as Aaron is to Moses? Except that there is no Prophet after me. It is not allowed that I leave, except if you are my successor (in Madina).'

The Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: 'You are my trustee in all believers after me.' He said: 'Blockade all the door except the door of Ali.' He said: He used to enter the mosque while in the state of ritual impurity, because it the path to his house. He said: 'Whoever beloved friend I am, Ali is also beloved friend.'

The Prophet (s.a.w) sent Abubakar to Makka with the Chapter of Repentance. He travel with it for three days. Then he said to Ali: 'Go to him, ask him to come back and you shall deliver the message.' He does as he was commanded. When Abubakar come back crying and he said: 'O Prophet of Allah! Is something revealed concerning me?' He replied: 'No, but I was commanded that nobody shall deliver a message from me except a man from me.'"

We reply thus: This hadith is Mursal (see footnote number 33) that is if 'Amr bin Maimoun has ever said it. There are a lot of lies in it against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) such as his words: "Aren't you pleased to be unto me as Aaron is unto Moses, but you are not a Prophet. It is not allowed that I leave (Madina) except that you are my representative (overseer) in it." This is false because the Prophet (s.a.w) has travelled many times and his overseer in Madina is not Ali. He went for lesser pilgrimage of Hudaibiyyah together with Ali and the overseer over Madina is somebody else. He went to the battle of Khaibar with Ali and at that time the overseer over Madina is somebody else. He went for the conquest of Makka with Ali and the overseer over Madina is not Ali. He went for the battles of Ta'if and Hunain with Ali and thus the overseer over Madina is other than him. He went for the farewell pilgrimage with Ali and thus the overseer over Madina is not Ali and Ali is at the battle of Badr with the Prophet (s.a.w) and the overseer over Madina is somebody else. All these are facts and are known with sound chains of authorities and the consensus of scholars of hadith (and history) and Ali has been with him in most of the battles even if the battle did not take place.

If it said that appointing him to oversee Madina indicated that he does not appoint but the best (among his companions), it entailed that Ali is not the best in most of his lesser and major pilgrimages and especially that all the times the overseers over Madina are other

believing men. In the year of Tabuk campaign Ali was made the overseer over women, children, the weak and the infirmed, who are excused by Allah, the three men who stayed back and those who are accused of hypocrisy and the city of Madina at that time is secured. Nothing is feared to occur to its inhabitants and thus it does not need an overseer (as a matter of necessity) while leaving it for Jihad (at that time) as he is required and needed at other times.

With regard to his words: “And blockade all doors except the door of Ali.” This is one of the hadith that Shia fabricated as a way of countering another sound hadiths, because the hadith that come in Bukhari and Muslim from Sa’id al-Khudri (r.a), who said the Prophet (s.a.w) said during his terminal illness: ***“No doubt, I am indebted to Abubakar more than to anybody else regarding both his companionship and his wealth. And if I had to take a Khalil (bosom friend) from my followers, I would certainly have taken Abubakar, but the fraternity of Islam is sufficient. Let no door (i.e. Khoukha) of the Mosque remain open, except the door of Abubakar” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

His words: “You are my trustee in every believer after me.” This is a fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith and the sound hadiths that has been stated in this regard (by the Rafidi) are not indicating the qualities of a leader. Nay, they are also not exclusive trait of Ali (r.a), for other people have shared in the same virtues with him. Such as he loves Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger loves him. Such as his being appointed to oversee Madina or that he is unto him as Aaron is unto Moses. Such as Ali loves whoever the Prophet (s.a.w) love for all believers love Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), and such as conveying the verse of absolvment – Chapter Nine of the Qur’an - (breaking a treaty from one side) which nobody can deliver except a man from Bani Hashim; this virtue or trait is shared by all Bani Hashim, for it has been reported that the prevailing custom and tradition of the Arabs at that time is that nobody can make an agreement (pertaining to war or peace) or revoke it (from one side, by declaring war) except the leader himself or a person from his clan.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED MOSTLY FABRICATED VIRTUES OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "Among those hadiths are what have been recorded by Ahktab Khawarizim that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'O Ali if a slave of Allah worshipped Him the like of the period that Prophet Noah (a.s) preached to his people (950 years), he has properties of gold as big as the Mountain of Uhud and he spent it all in the way of Allah and he was given long life until he performs one thousand pilgrimages on foot and thereafter, he was killed between Safa and Marwa (two locations in the Grand Mosque at Makka) unjustly and he did not love you O Ali! He will not smell the fragrance of Paradise and he will not enter it.'

A man said to Salman: 'You love Ali ardently! He replied: 'I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying: Whoever loves Ali loves me and whoever angered Ali has angered me.'

Anas said, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Allah created out of light of the face of Ali seventy thousands Angels, who will continue to be supplicating for Allah's forgiveness to those who love Ali, until the Last Day.'

Ibn Umar said: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Whoever loves Ali Allah will accept his prayers, fasting, night recommended prayers and respond to his supplications. Listen! Whoever loves Ali, Allah will give him for each drop of his sweat a city in Paradise. Listen! Whoever loves the family of Muhammad (s.a.w) he will be given security from accounting (in the Hereafter), the scale and the Sirat (a path over Hell leading to Paradise). Listen! Whoever hates the family of Muhammad, he will come on the Day of Resurrection written between his eyes: 'He has no hope for Allah's mercy.'

Abdullah bin Mas'ud said: 'I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying: Whoever claimed that he believed in me and what I brought and at the same time he hates Ali; then he a liar, he is not a believer.'

From Abu Barza who said the Prophet (s.a.w) once said while we are seated: 'A person will not move in the Hereafter until he asked by Allah the Most High about four things: How did he spent his life, on

what he uses his body, about his wealth how did he get it and how did he spent it and about our love; people of the house. Umar said: What is the sign of loving you (people of the house) after you? He placed his hand on the head of Ali bin Abi Talib who is seated beside him and said: Surely loving me after me is to love this one.'

Abdullah bin Umar said: The Prophet (s.a.w) said after he was asked: 'With which voice did your Lord spoke with you at the night of the ascension to the sky? He spoke to me with the voice of Ali, and he gave me the ability to ask: O my Lord, are you speaking to me or Ali is speaking to me? He replied to me saying: O Muhammad, I am not like all things and thus, I cannot be compared to things, I cannot be measured with people and I cannot be described by things. I created you from my light and created Ali from you light, I look at the secret of your heart and I found that your heart loves Ali the most, so I spoke to you with his tongue so that you will have rest of mind.'

Ibn Abbas said: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'If all gardens are pens and all oceans are ink, all the Jinns are counting and all human beings are writing, they cannot be able to enumerate the virtues of Ali.'

And with chain of authority he said: The Prophet said: 'Allah has made uncountable the recompense for the virtues of Ali. Therefore, whoever remembers one of his virtues and believe in it, Allah will forgive him his past and coming sins. Whoever writes one of his virtues, the Angels will be praying for forgiveness for him until that writing is lost (or erased). Whoever listen to the virtues of Ali, Allah will forgive him all the sins he committed through listening with his ears. Whoever looks in to a book on the virtues of Ali, Allah will forgive him the sins that he has committed through looking with his eyes. Then he said looking at the face of Ali is an act of worship, remembering him is an act of worship. Allah will not accept the belief of His servant except if he love Ali and absolve himself from his enemies.'

From Hukaim bin Huzam, from his father, from his grandfather who said: The Prophet said: 'The dual fighting between Ali and 'Amr bin

Abdu-wad on the day of the battle of the ditch (Khandaq) is better than the act of worship of my community until the Last Day.'

Amir bi Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas reported on the authority of his father that Mu'awiyyah bin Abi Sufyan appointed Sa'ad as the Governor and said: ***"What prevents you from abusing Abu Turab (Hadrat 'Ali), whereupon he said: It is because of three things which I remember Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) having said about him that I would not abuse him and even if I find one of those three things for me, it would be more dear to me than the red camels. I heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) say about 'Ali as he left behind him in one of his campaigns (that was Tabuk). 'All said to him: Allah's Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said to him: Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses but with this exception that there is no prophethood after me. And I (also) heard him say on the Day of Khaibar: I would certainly give this standard to a person who loves Allah and his Messenger and Allah and his Messenger love him too. He (the narrator) said: We have been anxiously waiting for it, when he (the Holy Prophet) said: Call 'Ali. He was called and his eyes were inflamed. He applied saliva to his eyes and handed over the standard to him, and Allah gave him victory. (The third occasion is this) when the (following) verse was revealed:" Let us summon our children and your children." Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) called 'Ali, Fitima, Hasan and Husain and said: O Allah, they are my family" (Muslim).***

We reply to the above submissions as follows: Akhtab Khawarizmi has a written on book on this issue (virtues of Ali), which contained fabricated hadiths against the Prophet (s.a.w) and whose being fabricated is not hidden to those who have limited knowledge of the science of hadith let alone the scholars of hadith! He is neither among the scholars of hadith, nor among those who are referred to

on this science. These hadiths that he cited are known to be fabricated by all scholars of hadith.

This Rafidi (in the beginning of his book) stated that he will only mention what is sound with the Ahlus Sunnah and what they have recorded in their reliable books and statements! Then why is he mentioning what they have agreed upon to be lies and fabrications; they have not been recorded in their reliable book of hadiths and nobody among the scholars of hadith has authenticated them! The first ten hadith he has mentioned are all lies and fabrications against the Prophet (s.a.w) – that is from the first one to the in which he mentioned dual fighting between Ali and ‘Amr bin Abdu-wad.

With regard to the hadith of Sa’ad in which Mu’awiyah asked him: ***“What prevents you from abusing Abu Turab (Hadrat ‘Ali), whereupon he said: It is because of three things which I remember Allah’s Messenger (may peace be upon him) having said about him that I would not abuse him and even if I find one of those three things for me, it would be more dear to me than the red camels. I heard Allah’s Messenger (may peace be upon him) say about ‘Ali as he left behind him in one of his campaigns (that was Tabuk). ‘Ali said to him: Allah’s Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children. Thereupon Allah’s Messenger (may peace be upon him) said to him: Aren’t you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses but with this exception that there is no prophethood after me. And I (also) heard him say on the Day of Khaibar: I would certainly give this standard to a person who loves Allah and his Messenger and Allah and his Messenger love him too. He (the narrator) said: We have been anxiously waiting for it, when he (the Holy Prophet) said: Call ‘Ali. He was called and his eyes were inflamed. He applied saliva to his eyes and handed over the standard to him, and Allah gave him victory. (The third occasion is this) when the (following) verse was revealed:” Let us summon our children and your children.” Allah’s Messenger (may peace be upon him) called ‘Ali, Fitima, Hasan and Husain and said: O Allah, they are my family”***

(Muslim). In this hadith there are three virtues of Ali, but they are all not characteristics of leaders (Imams) (and they neither indicated that someone has been appointed to be a leader). They are also not exclusive virtues of Ali (for other people have shared similar traits with him). His statement: “... **left behind him in one of his campaigns (that was Tabuk). 'Ali said to him: Allah's Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children...**” This is not an exclusive virtue (of Ali) for the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed many people to oversee Madina in his absence and his appointment is not more perfect than that of the others and that is why he said: “... **Allah's Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children...**” This is because in each war the Prophet (s.a.w) used to leave behind in Madina many men, but in the campaign of Tabuk he asked all Muslims to go with him and nobody remained in Madina except the disobedient, or the excluded due to sickness and women and children and that is why he hated to be left as its overseer and said: “...**Allah's Messenger, you leave me behind along with women and children...**” He is saying: Are you leaving me instead of taking me with you? And that is why the prophet (s.a.w) explained to him that he is left to oversee Madina, not because of any defect in him or some ill will against him; nay because Prophet Moses (a.s) left Aaron (a.s) to oversee his people because he trusted him. So, the same thing with you, I appointed you to oversee the town because I trusted you; but the difference is that Moses appointed a Prophet to oversee the people and there is no prophet after me (or with me).

Thus, the comparison is based on the reality of appointment to oversee: Prophet Moses (a.s) appointed Prophet Aaron (a.s) over all the Israelites and the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed Ali over a few Muslims for he has gone with most of them for the campaign (of Tabuk).

Comparing Ali to Prophet Aaron is not greater than comparing Abubakar and Umar; the former with Abraham and Jesus and the latter with Noah and Moses.^[114] This is because those four men are better than Aaron and each of them (Abubakar and Umar) was

compared with two Prophets and not one. Therefore, their comparison is greater than the comparison of Ali; in addition to that the appointment of Ali to oversee Madina is similar to the appointment of other companions (to oversee it).

SEGMENT: RESPONDING TO THE FABRICATED HADITH OF THE DAY OF CONSULTATION

The Rafidi stated: "From 'Amir bin Wathilah who said: "I was with Ali on the day of the consultation (of appointing a Caliph between him and Uthman), where Ali said I will argue with you with what the Arab and the none Arab among you cannot be able to change (or contest). The he said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who has the like of my brother Ja'afar – the one who is flying in Paradise with Angels; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah.' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who has uncle like my uncle Hamza – lion of Allah, lion of the Prophet (s.a.w) and master of the martyrs; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who has a wife like my wife Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the thief of women of Paradise; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who have children like my children – Hasan and Husain, the masters of youths in Paradise; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who has held ten private consultations with the Prophet (s.a.w) and he gave out charity before each consultation other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: Whoever beloved friend I am, Ali is his beloved friend. O Allah love whoever love him and be an enemy to whoever is an enemy to him. Let those who are present inform those who are absent; other than me.' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: O Allah bring to me the most beloved of your created beings so that he eat this bird with me; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!'

He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet said concerning him: I will surely give this flag tomorrow to a man who loves Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His Messenger loves him and he will not come back until Allah give him victory – because other than me come back defeated - other than

me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) threatened Bani Wa'il with him, saying: You either desist what you are doing or I will send to you a man who is like myself; his obedience is my obedience and his disobedience is my disobedience, who will deal with you with sword; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: Whoever says that he loves and hates this one (at the same time) is a liar; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who was greeted by three thousand Angels at the same time: Gabriel, Mika'il, and Israfil (among them) when I brought water to the Prophet in a container; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who an announcer announced from the Heavens: No sword except Zulfiqar and no brave youth except Ali; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who Angel Gabriel said concerning him: This is the comforter. The Prophet (s.a.w) replied him saying: He is from me and I am from him. Gabriel said I am from both of you; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: You will fight those who break their covenant, those who deviated from the right path and those who rebelled; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you who the Prophet said concerning him: I surely fought over the revelation of Qur'an and you will fight over its interpretation; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the sun was brought back for him so that he can pray the late afternoon ('Asr) prayer in its right time; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) commanded to take "the absolvment," from Abubakar. He said: O Prophet has something been revealed concerning me? The Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: Nobody can deliver message on my behalf except Ali?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone

among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: Nobody loves you but a believer and nobody hates you but a hypocrite; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, that he consulted privately with during the battle of Ta'if and you said: You consulted him alone. He replied: it is not I who choose to consult him, but Allah chooses him; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: The truth is with Ali and Ali is with truth and it will be with him wherever he go?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him; I am leaving with you two weighty things, the Book of Allah and my progeny, my household. You will not be astray if you take hold of them and they will not be separated until they meet me at the cistern?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who protect the Prophet (s.a.w) from the polytheists and lay down on his bed; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who fought 'Amr bin Abdu-wad al-'Amiri when he invited you for a duel; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!'

He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, on whose account the verse of purification was revealed: **'...Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet), and to purify you with a thorough purification' (33:33)**; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: You are the master of believers; other than me?' They replied: 'No, by Allah!' He said: 'I ask you by Allah, is there anyone among you, who the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning him: I never ask Allah for a thing, but I pray for you similar to it; other than me?' They replied: 'No by Allah''

"Among his virtues are what has been reported by Abu 'Amr, the ascetic from Abdullah bin Abbas who said: 'Ali has four traits which he did not share with anybody. He is the first Arabs and none Arab that prayed with the Prophet (s.a.w). The flag of the Prophet (s.a.w)

is always with him in all military campaigns, he remain steadfast with the Prophet in the battle of Hunain and he is the one who washed him and entered him into his grave.

The Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'In the night I ascended to the Heavens, I passed by some people whose mouths are being cut with saw, I asked Gabriel: Who are those?' He replied: 'Those are men cutting down people with backstabbing.' I passed by some people who are so lean and I asked Gabriel: 'Who are those?' He replied: 'Those are unbelievers.' When we reached the fourth Heaven we saw Ali praying: I said: 'O Gabriel! This is Ali, he arrived before us.' He replied: 'No, this is not Ali.' I asked: 'Who is he?' He replied: 'This is an Angel. When the Angels that are close to Allah and the Angels that aided those in distress heard the exclusive traits and virtues of Ali and heard your statement: You are unto me as Aaron is to Moses except that there is no Prophet after me, they covet to see Ali and Allah created an Angel on the visage of Ali, so whenever they desired to see Ali they will come to this place and it is as if they have seen him.'

Ibn Abbas said: The prophet (s.a.w) said one day when he is feeling lively: 'I am the youth, son of the youth and brother of the youth.' Ibn Abbas said: 'What he means by I am the youth is that he is an Arab youth, by son of the youth he means the son of Abraham (a.s) and Allah said: **"They said: "We heard a young man talking (against) them who is called Ibrahim (Abraham)" (21:60).** And what he means by the brother of the youth is the brother of Ali; that is the meaning of the words of Gabriel on the day of the battle of Badr, while he is ascending to the sky in a happy mood saying: No sword except Zulfiqar and no brave youth except Ali.'

Ibn Abbas said: 'I saw Abu Dhar hanging on the cover of the Ka'abah, while he is saying: Whoever knows me knew me and those who did not know me; I am Abu Dhar. If you fast until you became like string (in leanness) and you prayed until you became curved (like bow); that will not benefit you, if you do not love Ali.'

We reply above assertions as follows: With regard to the statements he claimed has been made by 'Amir bin Wathilah on the day of

Shurah (consultation to choose a leader after the murder of Umar bin Khattab)! Then know that it is a lie and fabrication by consensus of the scholars of science of hadith and Ali did not say anything like that or similar to that; nay Abdurrahman bin 'Auf said to him: If I appoint you will you do justice? He replied: Yes. He said again: And if I give the vow of allegiance to Uthman, will you listen and obey? He replied: Yes. He said the same thing to Uthman and Uthman replied to him with affirmatives. He thereafter spent three days consulting the Muslims (to hear their views, on who they preferred to be appointed as the next Caliph).

It comes in a sound hadith in both Bukhari and Muslim and this is the version of Bukhari as narrated by 'Amr bin Maimoun: ***“When he (Umar) was buried, the group (recommended by 'Umar) held a meeting. Then 'Abdurrahman said, ‘Reduce the candidates for rulership to three of you.’ Zubair said, ‘I give up my right to Ali.’ Talha said, ‘I give up my right to 'Uthman,’ and Sa’ad said, ‘I give up my right to 'Abdurrahman bin 'Auf.’ 'Abdurrahman then said (to 'Uthman and 'Ali), ‘Now which of you is willing to give up his right of candidacy to that he may choose the better of the (remaining) two, bearing in mind that Allah and Islam will be his witnesses.’ So both the sheiks (i.e. 'Uthman and 'Ali) kept silent. 'Abdurrahman said, ‘Will you both leave this matter to me, and I take Allah as my Witness that I will not choose but the better of you?’ They said, ‘Yes.’ So 'Abdurrahman took the hand of one of them (i.e. 'Ali) and said, ‘You are related to Allah's Apostle and one of the earliest Muslims as you know well. So I ask you by Allah to promise that if I select you as a ruler you will do justice, and if I select 'Uthman as a ruler you will listen to him and obey him.’ Then he took the other (i.e. 'Uthman) aside and said the same to him. When 'Abdurrahman secured (their agreement to) this covenant, he said, ‘O 'Uthman! Raise your hand.’ So he (i.e. 'Abdurrahman) gave him (i.e. 'Uthman) the solemn pledge, and then 'Ali gave him the pledge of allegiance and then all the (Medina) people gave him the pledge of allegiance” (Bukhari).***

In the hadith that the Rafidi has mentioned, there are many types of lies which Allah has absolved and protected Ali from making, such as his arguments with his brother, uncle and wife, while he is better than those people and he knew that the most honored in the sight of Allah is the most pious as Allah has said: **“O mankind! We have created you from a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know one another. Verily, the most honorable of you with Allah is the pious (believer)” (49:13).** If Abbas has said (as an argumentation): Is there anybody among you who is like my brother Hamza and the like of the children of my brothers such as Muhammad (s.a.w), Ali and Ja’afar? This argument will be similar to that one; nay arguments of a person with the children of his brother are greater than his argumentation with his cousins. And if Uthman said: Is there any one among you who married two daughters of the Prophet (s.a.w), his argument will be like that of the one who said: Is there anybody among you whose wife is like my wife? Fatima (has been his wife) for she has died before the consultation; she died six months after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). The wives of Uthman have also died since the Prophet (s.a.w) was alive. Similar counter arguments can be advanced to the like of; is there any one among you who has a child like my child?

There a lot of lies in the statement of the Rafidi, such as: “I never ask Allah for anything except that I prayed for similar things for you.” The same thing with his statement: “Nobody can convey my message but Ali,” for it is a lie. Al-Khattabi stated in his book “Shi’arud Deen:” And his words: “Nobody can convey my message except Ali or accept a person from my household.” This hadith has been fabricated by the people of Kufa from Zaid bin Yusha’u, he is accused of fabricating it and he is a Rafidi. The fact is that, most of those who delivered messages of the Prophet (s.a.w) are not members of his family. The Prophet (s.a.w) has sent ‘As’ad bin Zurarah to Madina (before the immigration) inviting people to Islam, teaching them the Qur’an and instructing them in religious fundamentals and branches. He sent al-‘Aala bin al-Hadrami to Bahrain for the same purpose, he sent

Mua'az bin Jabal and Abu Musa al-As'ari to Yemen. And he sent Attab bin Usaid to Makka (after its conquest). Thus, where is the claim of the person who said nobody conveys the message of Islam except a man from his family?^[115]

There a lot of lies in the statements of this Rafidi and among them is the one ascribed to Ibn Abbas such as: "The flag of the Prophet used to be with Ali in all campaigns." This is a known lie because the flag of the Prophet (s.a.w) on the day of the battle of Uhud is with Mus'ab bin 'Umais, by the consensus of scholars. And his flag on the day of conquest of Makka is with Zubair bin 'Awwam and the Prophet (s.a.w) commanded him to raise it in a place called Hujum. In a hadith it was narrated by Nafi bin Jubair, who said: ***"I heard Abbas telling Zubair, 'The Prophet ordered you to fix the flag here' (Bukhari, Muslim).*** With regard to what the Rafidi claimed: 'He (Ali) is the one who remained steadfast with him on the day of the battle of Hunain.' This is another lie, because it is well known that the person who is closest to the Prophet (s.a.w) on that day and in the battle ground as it rages are Abbas bin Abdulmutallab and Abu Sufyan bin Harith bin Abdulmutallab and Abbas is the one who is holding the bridle of his mule while Abu Sufyan is holding the stirrup. In a hadith: ***"It has been narrated on the authority of 'Abbas who said: I was in the company of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on the Day of Hunain. I and Abd Sufyan b. Harith bin 'Abd al-Muttalib stuck to the Messenaer of Allah (may peace be upon him) and we did not separate from him. And the Messenger of Allah (may place be upon him) was riding on his white mule which had been presented to him by Farwa b. Nufitha al-Judhami. When the Muslims had an encounter with the disbelievers, the Muslims fled, falling back, but the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) began to spur his mule towards the disbelievers. I was holding the bridle of the mule of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) checking it from going very fast, and Abu Sufyan was holding the stirrup of the (mule of the) Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him), who said: Abbas, call out to the people of al-***

Samura. Abbas (who was a man with a loud voice) called out at the top of the voice: Where are the people of Samura? (Abbas said:) And by God, when they heard my voice, they came back (to us) as cows come back to their calves, and said: We are present, we are present! 'Abbas said: They began to fight the infidels. Then there was a call to The Ansar. Those (who called out to them) shouted: O ye party of the Ansar! O party of the Ansar! Banu al-Harith bin al-Khazraj were the last to be called. Those (who called out to them) shouted: O Banu Al-Harith bin al-Khazraj! O BanU Harith b. al-Khazraj! And the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) who was riding on his mule looked at their fight with his neck stretched forward and he said: This is the time when the fight is raging hot. Then the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) took (some) pebbles and threw them in the face of the infidels. Then he said: By the Lord of Muhammad, the infidels are defeated. 'Abbas said: I went round and saw that the battle was in the same condition in which I had seen it. By Allah, it remained in the same condition until he threw the pebbles. I continued to watch until I found that their force had been spent out and they began to retreat” (Muslim).

With regard to washing him and entering him into his grave; this was carried out together with members of his household such as Abbas, his children, his client Shaqran and some Ansar. But it was Ali who carried out the washing while Abbas is present due to his exalted position and because Ali more deserved to wash him than anyone among them.

With regard to his words: “He is the first Arab and none Arab to pray.” This is not true and it also contradicted what Ibn Abbas reported in a sound hadith.

SEGMENT: THE HADITH OF ASCENSION IS FALSE AND A FABRICATED LIE

With regard to the hadith of ascension to Heavens in which he stated: “Surely the Angel that are close to Allah and the Angels that aid people in distress, when they heard the exclusive virtues of Ali and the words of the Prophet (s.a.w): ‘Are you not satisfied to be unto me as Aaron is unto Moses?’ They all yearned to see Ali and Allah created for them an Angel on his visage...”

We reply that: This is a lie fabricated by the ignorant that is not good at telling lies: The ascension to the Heavens took place in Makka before immigration to Madina by the consensus of all Muslims and their scholars. Allah the Most High said: **“Glorified (and Exalted) be He (Allah) [above all that (evil) they associate with Him] Who took His slave (Muhammad SAW) for a journey by night from Al-Masjid-al-Haram (at Makkah) to the farthest mosque (in Jerusalem), the neighborhood whereof We have blessed, in order that We might show him (Muhammad SAW) of Our Signs; Verily, He is the All-Hearer, the All-Seer” (17:1).** Therefore, the ascension is from the Sacred Mosque in Makka. Allah the Exalted said: **“By the star when it goes down, (or vanishes). Your companion (Muhammad SAW) has neither gone astray nor has erred. Nor does he speak of (his own) desire. It is only an Inspiration that is inspired” (53:14).** Allah also said: **“Will you then dispute with him (Muhammad SAW) about what he saw [during the Mi'raj: (Ascent of the Prophet SAW over the seven heavens)]. And indeed he (Muhammad SAW) saw him [Jibrael (Gabriel)] at a second descent (i.e. another time). Near it is the Paradise of Abode” (53:12-15).** And Allah the Most High said: **“Indeed he (Muhammad) did see, of the Greatest Signs, of his Lord (Allah)” (53:19).** All of these verses are revealed in Makka by the consensus of all Muslims.

The statement: ***“Are you not satisfied to be unto me as Aaron is to Moses?”*** These words were uttered by the Prophet (s.a.w) while he is going out for Tabuk military campaign, which was the last war

of the eighth year after immigration to Madina. Then, how can anybody say that: The Angels in the night of the ascension (which took place in Makka before immigration to Madina) has heard him saying: ***“Are you not satisfied to be unto me as Aaron is to Moses?”***

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE FALLACY OF THE HADITH OF SHIA: 'I AM THE YOUTH'

The hadith he has ascribed to Ibn Abbas, that he says, the Prophet (s.a.w) said one day while he is feeling lively: "I am the youth, son of the youth and brother of the youth." He (Ibn Abbas) said, what he means by 'I am the youth,' is I am an Arab youth; by stating, 'son of the youth' he means Prophet Abraham (a.s), for Allah said: **"They said: We heard a youth talking (against) them who is called Ibrahim (Abraham)." (21:60).** And what he means by 'brother of the youth,' is Ali bin Abi Talib and it is the meaning of the statement of Gabriel in the day of Badr, while he is ascending to the sky in a happy mood saying: "No sword except Zulfiqar and no brave youth except Ali." Undoubtedly, this hadith is fabricated, coined lies by the consensus of scholars of hadith and its being a lie can be discerned even from its context, without troubling oneself to study and evaluate its chain of authority. Its being fabricate is understood from many angles:

- i. The word 'youth' is not a quality of praise in the Qur'an, Sunnah and the Arabic language and likewise it is not a quality of disparagement. It is just a name like any other name such as adolescent, teenage, young man, old man, or worn-down etc.! And those who said concerning Abraham (a.s): **"They said: We heard a youth talking (against) them who is called Ibrahim (Abraham),"** are unbelievers and they do not intend to praise him with that, for a 'youth' is like a 'young man.'
- ii. The Prophet (s.a.w) is greater than boasting with his grandfather and his cousin.
- iii. The Prophet (s.a.w) never takes Ali or anyone else as his brother (when the Prophet's companions are made brothers after migration to Madina). The hadiths that talked of making bond of brotherhood between the Prophet (s.a.w) and Ali or making bond of brotherhood between Abubakar and Umar are all lies. What happened is that the Prophet made bond of brotherhood between the Muhajirun and Ansar and he never join a Muhajir and a Muhajir as brothers.

- iv. The so called announcement of Gabriel on the day of Badr is a lie.
- v. The sword called Zulfiqar does not belongs to Ali for it is one of the swords belonging to Abu Jahal which Muslims acquired as war booty on that day. Thus, on the day of the battle of Badr, the sword Zulfiqar does not belong to the Muslims (or any Muslim), nay it is a sword of the unbelievers and this has been recorded by the authors of Sunan compendiums of hadith. It has been narrated by Ahmad, Tirmidhi and Ibn Majah on the authority of Ibn Abbas that the Prophet (s.a.w) got the sword Zulfiqar as war booty on the day of the battle of Badr (after the battle).[\[116\]](#)
- vi. That the prophet (s.a.w) has already passed the age of adolescence before he was sent as a Prophet of Allah.

SEGMENT: CONCERNING THE WORDS ASCRIBED TO ABU DHAR ON LOVING ALI

With regard to the hadith of Abu Dhar which has been mentioned by the Rafidi: It is a statement that stopped with Abu Dhar and thus, it is not a proof. It is doubtful that Abu Dhar has made such a statement.

We say this, although loving Ali is obligatory, but that is not his exclusive trait or virtue; nay it is compulsory upon us to love him and likewise it is compulsory upon us to love Uthman, Umar, Abubakar and love the Ansar. Narrated Anas bin Malik: The Prophet said, ***“Love for the Ansar is a sign of faith and hatred for the Ansar is a sign of hypocrisy” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** It is reported in another sound hadith concerning Ali: ***“Zirr reported: ‘Ali observed: ‘By Him Who split up the seed and created something living, the Apostle (may peace and blessings be upon him) gave me a promise that no one but a believer would love me, and none but a hypocrite would nurse grudge against me” (Muslim).***

SEGMENT: ON THE FABRICATED HADITH: LOVE OF ALI IS A GOODNESS THAT IS NOT IMPAIRED BY EVIL

The Rafidi stated: “Among his virtues is what has been narrated by the author of the book “al-Firdaus,” in his book from Mu’az bin Jabal, who says, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: “Loving Ali is a goodness that cannot be harmed or affected by committing evil deeds, and hating Ali is an evil deed by which no good deed is beneficial.”

We reply thus: The book ‘al-firdaus’ contained a lot of fabricated hadiths and the author Shirowaih bin Shahrदार al-Dulaimi, although he is a student of hadith and its narrators; but these hadiths that he has collected in a book form and deleted its chains of authorities without considering its sound, its weak and its fabricated; that is why it contained a lot of fabricated hadiths.

Every Muslim will bear witness that the Prophet (s.a.w) cannot make this type of statement, for surely the love of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) is greater than the love of Ali and evil deeds harms even if one loves Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). The Prophet (s.a.w) was executing punishment upon Abdullah bin Hammar for drinking wine and he says: **“He surely loves Allah and His Messenger” (Bukhari)**. And every believer loves Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and committing evil harms him. Undoubtedly all Muslims agreed upon the fact that associating partner with Allah harms whoever does so and Allah will not forgive the polytheist even if he loves Ali bin Abi Talib; surely his father loves him and polytheism has harmed him and the extremist Shia are saying that they love him, and they are unbelievers of the denizens of Hell-Fire. Summarily, this statement entailed apostasy of whoever believes in it for which he will be asked to repent: This shall not be stated by anyone who believes in Allah and the Last Day.

His statement that: “Hating him is an evil deed by which no good deed is beneficial to the one who commits it,” is also a false statement, because whoever hates him; if he is a disbeliever it is his disbelief that sends him to Hell and if he is a believer, his belief will

benefit him even if he hates him. The hadith that has been ascribed to Ibn Mas'ud that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: "Loving family of Muhammad for a day is better than one year act of worship and whoever died upon it will enter Paradise:" And what is ascribed to the Prophet (s.a.w) that he said: "Myself and this man are the proofs of Allah upon His servants:" They are two fabricated hadiths by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Acts of worship for a year contained five daily prayers, fasting in the month of Ramadan and Muslim have agreed upon that those acts of worship cannot be replaced by the love of Muhammad's family for a month let alone loving them for a day?

Also the proof of Allah over His servants has been upheld through His Messengers only, Allah the Most High said: **"Messengers as bearers of good news as well as of warning in order that mankind should have no plea against Allah after the Messengers. And Allah is Ever AllPowerful, AllWise"** (4:165).

Allah did not say: After the Prophets and Imams or legatees etc. [\[117\]](#)

The same thing with the statement: If people agreed upon the love of Ali, Allah will not create Hell-Fire. This is a clear lie by the consensus of men of knowledge and religion. Even if all people agreed upon loving Ali, that will not benefit them, until they believe in Allah, His Messenger, His Books, the last Day and do good righteous works; if they did that, they will enter Paradise even if they absolutely never know Ali and it never occurs to their hearts either loving him or hating him. [\[118\]](#)

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING SOME FABRICATED HADITHS ON THE VIRTUES OF ALI

The hadith that the Rafidi mentioned on the covenant that Allah made concerning Ali, that he is the flag of guidance, the leader of the friends of Allah, and the word of piety that Allah made them to stick to etc.![[119](#)] All these are fabricated lies by the consensus of scholars of hadith and mere mentioning it by the author of “Hilyatul Awliya’a,” and other writers do not benefit or show that it is sound. The author of Hilyatul Awliya’a has also recorded the virtues of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali and other friends of Allah and mentioned therein a lot of weak and fabricated narrations, by the consensus of scholars of hadith. The author is among the reliable scholars of hadith on what he narrated from his teachers and the fault and defects are in what he narrated from other people. And the hadiths that he has cited from ‘Ammar and Ibn Abbas are all fabricated lies.

SEGMENT: RESPONDING TO SHIA RAFIDA CENSURES AGAINST THE COMPANIONS

The Rafidi stated: “With regard to disparaging the generality of the companions; many scholars have mentioned a lot of it to the extent that al-Kalbi wrote a book titled “Mathalib as-Sahabah,” and he never mentioned in it one defect against members of the Prophet’s household.”

We reply thus: Before we enter into detailed reply on what are being mentioned of disparagements and censures we say: That what are being narrated concerning the Prophets companions (r.a) of censured are of two categories:

i. That which is a lie: Either it is absolutely and completely a lie or an altered story in which additions are made to it or some things are deleted from it, so that will be made to look evil and thus, deserving censure and blame. These types of stories are being narrated by liars who are known to be notorious liars, such as Abi mikhnaf Lut bin Yahya, Hisham bin Sa’ib al-Kalbi and those who are similar to them in fabrications, slanders and lies. That is why this Rafidi is proving his case with some of Hisham al-Kalbi’s lies; he is known to be one of the greatest liars and he is a Shia Rafidi. He usually narrates from his father and his father narrates from Abi Mikhnaf; and all of them are abandoned (by scholars of hadith) liars.

ii. That which is truth: In most of those issues, there are justifications that remove them from committing sins and placed them within the purview of Ijtihad upon which if the Mujtahid is correct he will receive two recompenses and if he made mistake he will receive one recompense. Most of what is being narrated concerning the right guided Caliphs are within this type and if there is anything that has been confirmed as sin; its punishment will be lifted in the Hereafter due to many reasons; among which are:

a. Repentance: It has been reported concerning Shia Imamiyyah Imams that they have repented from sins that are known to be committed by them.^[120] Allah said: **“Except those who repent and believe (in Islamic Monotheism), and do righteous deeds, for**

those, Allah will change their sins into good deeds, and Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful” (25:70). He also said: “**And He it is Who accepts repentance from His slaves, and forgives sins, and He knows what you do**” (42:25). Allah also informed us that through sincere repentance people are given provision, made wealthy and given more children: “**I said (to them): 'Ask forgiveness from your Lord; Verily, He is Oft-Forgiving; 'He will send rain to you in abundance; 'And give you increase in wealth and children, and bestow on you gardens and bestow on you rivers**” (71:10-12). In a hadith the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“If anyone seek pardon (from Allah), Allah will appoint for him a way out of every distress and relief from every anxiety, and will provide sustenance for him from where he expects not” (Abu Dawud)***. Allah the Exalted loves among His servants those who turn to Him in repentance. He said in the Qur “ an: “**...Truly, Allah loves those who turn unto Him in repentance and loves those who purify themselves (by taking a bath and cleaning and washing thoroughly their private parts, bodies, for their prayers, etc.)” (2:222)**. In a hadith the Messenger of Allah said: ***“When a person repents, Allah rejoices more than one of you who found his camel after he lost it in the desert” (Bukhari, Muslim)***.

b. Good works that erases sins: Avoiding great sins make Allah to forgive small sins; likewise doing good deeds is a cause of forgiveness of sins. Allah said: “**If you avoid the great sins which you are forbidden to do, We shall remit from you your (small) sins, and admit you to a Noble Entrance (i.e. Paradise)” (4:31)**. The Messenger of Allah said: ***“The five daily prayers and Ramadan (Fasting) takes away bad deeds between one and the next, if you avoid major sins” (Muslim)***. In another hadith the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Whoever spends the night of Lailatul Qadr (Night of Power) in prayer out of faith and the hope of reward, his previous sins will be forgiven” (Bukhari)***. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) also said: ***“Whoever performs pilgrimage to this house and does not behave in an obscene or immoral way, he***

will go back free of sins like the day his mother gave birth to him” (Bukhari).

c. Calamities trials and tribulations by which Allah forgives sins: the Prophet (s.a.w) said in that regard: ***“No tiredness, exhaustion, worry, grief, distress or harm befalls a believer in this world, not even a thorn that pricks him, but Allah expiates some of his sins thereby” (Bukhari).***

d. Prayers and supplications of believers to each other (and supplication of believers to other believers): Allah says: ***“And those who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who have believed. Our Lord! You are indeed full of kindness, Most Merciful” (59:10).*** In this regard the Messenger of Allah said: ***“There is no Muslim who dies, and forty men pray for him, not associating partner with Allah, but Allah will accept their intercession for him” (Muslim).***

e. Seeking for forgiveness: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“If a person committed a sin, then say, „O Allah! I have committed a sin, so forgive me. “ He (Allah) will say: „My slave knows that he has a Lord who may forgive sin or punish for it; I have forgiven my slave... “ ” (Muslim, Bukhari).*** The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) told us that it is part of his habit to ask his Lord for forgiveness several times every day when he said: ***“By Allah I seek the forgiveness of Allah and turn to Him in repentance more than seventy times each day” (Bukhari).*** In another hadith he (s.a.w) said: ***“Our Lord comes down to the lowest heaven when one third of the night remains, and say, „Who will call upon Me so that I may answer him? Who will ask Me so that I will give him? Who will ask for My forgiveness so that I may forgive him” (Muslim).***

f. Intercession of the Prophet (s.a.w): The intercession of the Prophet (s.a.w), and of other people whom Allah gave such permission, or by some of their good acts on the Day of Judgment Allah says: ***“On that day no intercession shall avail, except the one for whom the Most Beneficent (Allah) has given permission and whose***

word is acceptable to Him” (20:109). In a hadith the Messenger of Allah said: ***“I was given the choice between admitting half of my community to Paradise and intercession, and I choose intercession” (Tabrani).***

There is not any reason or cause by which sins and punishment are lifted and or forgiven to any Imam among the Imams except that the Prophet’s companions more deserved it; they more deserved all praises and negation of all blames and censures than all those who come after them in the Islamic community.

The Rafidi stated: “Other than him (Hisham al-Kalbi) have mentioned a lot of things, but we are going to mention just a little of it. Among the criticisms is what has been stated concerning Abubakar, that he stated while standing on the pulpit that: ‘The Prophet (s.a.w) used to be protected by revelation, but I have a Satan who is trying to seduce me. Therefore whenever I am on the right path, you shall aid me and if I deviate, you shall correct me.’ How can the leadership of a person who sought the aid of his subjects for correction when he deviate be permissible, while it is his subjects who need him (to correct them)?”

We reply thus: This hadith is one of the biggest virtues of Abubakar as-Siddiq and the one that showed clearly he is not among those who rebelled against the truth with pride, nor is he among those who want to spread corruption and mischief in the land. It showed that he is not a person seeking for power and authority and that he has never been unjust or oppressive: He is a person who used to command people to obey Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). He once said to his subjects: ***“If I am steadfast in obeying Allah, assist me! And if I deviate, straighten me out!”*** He also said: ***“O people! Obey me as long as I obey Allah! But if I disobey Allah or His Prophet (s.a.w), you owe me no obedience.”***^[121]

The Satan that is trying to seduce him is also trying to seduce all children of Adam, for there is no human being except that he is being seduced by Satan. It was narrated that ‘Abdullah ibn Mas’ud said: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“There is no one among you but a companion from among the jinn has been assigned to***

him.” They said, “Even you, O Messenger of Allah?’ He said, “Even me, but Allah helped me with him and he became Muslim (or: and I am safe from him), so he only enjoins me to do that which is good” (Muslim). According to another report, **“... There is assigned to him a companion from among the jinn and a companion from among the angels” (Muslim).** What Abubakar as-Siddiq is telling people is that, I am not infallible like the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); and this is a fact, the truth and the reality.

The person who said: “How can the leadership of person who sought the aid of his subjects; to correct him if he deviates, be permissible, while his subjects needed him?” We reply that: These are nothing but words uttered by an ignorant person who doesn’t know the reality of leadership. Surely, a leader is not a lord over his subjects, so that he will have no need of them and he is not a Prophet of Allah, so that he can be a middle man between them and their Lord; but he and his subjects are associates and partners; they aid each other to attain religious and worldly benefits. Therefore, their aid to him is necessary and his aid to them is necessary also. They can be liken to a leader of a caravan who is travelling with his party on a road. If he leads them on a road they follow him, if he makes a mistake they correct him and guide him and if armed robbers attacked them they all together, defend themselves, fight him back and repel him. If a leader is more perfect in knowledge, has a strong will and is merciful to his subjects; that will be more beneficial to their condition.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITISIZED THE HUMILITY OF ABUBAKAR AS-SIDDIQ

The Rafidi stated: “He (Abubakar) said: ‘Take away this responsibility from me! I am not the best of you while there is Ali among you.’ If his leadership is correct and right, then his resignation from it is an act of disobedience (to Allah) and if it is false, our criticism and faulting it are correct.”^[122]

We reply: The above statement is a lie, it is nothing in the books of hadith, and it hasn't got any known chain of authority. Abubakar never said: “while Ali is among you...,” nay what he said at the day of Thaqlifa is: **“...So you should elect either 'Umar or Abu 'Ubaida bin Al-Jarrah as your ruler.” 'Umar said (to Abubakar), “No but we elect you, for you are our chief and the best amongst us and the most beloved of all of us to Allah's Apostle.” So 'Umar took Abubakar's hand and gave the pledge of allegiance and the people too gave the pledge of allegiance to Abubakar...” (Bukhari).** Umar said: **“I hated nothing of what he had said except that proposal, for by Allah, I would rather have my neck chopped off as expiator for a sin than become the ruler of a nation, one of whose members is Abubakar...” (Bukhari).**

The Rafidi stated: “Abubakar said; and Ali is among you,” If he means so that I appoint him instead of Umar; his words will be obeyed (if he does so). With regard to what the Rafidi said: “If his leadership is right, then his resignation from it is an act of disobedience (to Allah).” We reply that: If it is confirmed that he made that statement, then its being “right” may either means it is “permitted,” and by law it is allowed to abandon or shun what is permitted. Or it may mean it is “obligatory” (upon him) if they did not appoint somebody and they did not remove him, but if they remove him and appoint someone else, it is no more obligatory upon him.

A man can contract a sale agreement or a rental agreement and that agreement is right and then he can request for its abrogation (and that is also right). Abubakar, due to his humility and the weight of the responsibilities may request to be relieved, even if there is nobody

who deserved to be the leader more than him. Man's humility and humbleness did not abolish his right.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DESCRIBED VOW OF ALLEGIANCE TO ABUBAKAR AS A MISTAKE

The Rafidi stated: “Umar said: ‘The vow of allegiance to Abubakar was a mistake but Allah protected its evil consequences from the Muslims. Therefore, whoever repeats the like of it shall be killed.’ If his leadership is right, the person so appointed him will not deserve to be killed. Thus Umar shall be blamed for making such a statement and if it is a false appointment both of them deserved to be blamed and criticized.”

We reply: the full version of the hadith will be discussed later on, in which Umar said: ***“(O people!) I have been informed that a speaker amongst you says, ‘By Allah, if ‘Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such-and-such person.’ One should not deceive oneself by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abubakar was given suddenly and it was successful. No doubt, it was like that, but Allah saved (the people) from its evil, and there is none among you who has the qualities of Abubakar. Remember that whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consulting the other Muslims, neither that person, nor the person to whom the pledge of allegiance was given, are to be supported, lest they both should be killed” (Bukhari).*** What Umar means is that the vow of allegiance was rushed without delay because Abubakar has been defined for leadership as he has explained in the sentence: ***“and there is none among you who has the qualities of Abubakar...”***

The virtues of Abubakar over all the companions and his being forward by the Prophet (s.a.w) over all of them are clearly known issues, and indications of texts (hadiths) and signs of the Prophet (s.a.w) are so self-evident as to require wider consultation, long consideration and delay. In contrast to other than him; for it is not allowed to give anybody else vow of allegiance without consulting the Muslims and taking time for consideration. Thus, whoever gives

vow of allegiance to other than Abubakar, without delay, consideration and consultation; such action is rejected.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI SAID ABUBAKAR WAS SORRY FOR THE ANSAR BEFORE HIS DEATH

The Rafidi said: “Abubakar said before his death: ‘I wish that I have asked the Prophet (s.a.w), if the Ansar have right in this issue.’ This showed that he doubts his leadership and that it is not right.”

We reply thus: This is a lie against Abubakar, and this Rafidi did not mention any chain of authority for his narration. It is a well-known principle that chains of authority shall be cited when quotations are made. Now, how can we accept a quotation from someone who is disparaging the first and foremost Muslims by just mentioning a story that has no chain of authority (with which it can be tested and assessed)?

We add that: This story disproved what you are claiming about textual appointment of Ali, because if there is any text with regard to him, there would not be any right for the Ansar and there would not be doubt about his being the leader.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ATTACKED ABUBAKAR FOR HIS FEAR OF ALLAH

The Rafidi stated: “When Abubakar was dying he said: ‘I wish that my mother has not given birth to me! I wish that I am a block in a building!’ This, although they have narrated that the Prophet said: ‘Whoever is about to die, will be shown his abode, (either) Paradise or Hell.’”

We reply: That Abubakar has uttered those words before his death is not known, nay without any doubt it is a false assertion of the Rafidi. What has been confirmed is that before his death, Aisha (r.a) read a poem showing the transient nature of this world and its riches, after which Abubakar opened his face and said to her: The issue is not as you have mentioned, but you shall say instead: **“And the stupor of death will come in truth: ‘This is what you have been avoiding!’” (50:22).**

It has been narrated that while he is healthy and sound he said: ***“I wish my mother didn’t give birth to me!”*** Or something similar to that – if the narration is sound – and this type of statement has been narrated from the statement of many companions and that they made such statements out of fear of the fearful events of the Day of Judgment, to the extent that some of them say: If I am given a choice between judged and then granted Paradise and being turned to dust, I will prefer to be turned to dust. Ahmad narrated that, Abu Dhar said: ***“I swear by Allah, I wish that I am a tree that can be chewed and thrown out.”***

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR FEAR'S LEDERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: "Abubakar said: 'I wish when we were at the shade of Bani Sa'ada (at Thaqifa), I gave vow of allegiance to one of those men (Umar or Abu Ubaidah), so that he became the leader and I become his vizier.' He (the Rafidi) said: This showed that he is not good to be the leader by his own estimation."^[123]

We reply: This is one of the greatest proofs that Ali has not been Divinely appointed to be the leader, for the one who made that statement, uttered it out of fear of Allah from wasting the right of leadership and that if somebody become the leader he will just became his adviser. Thus, absolving himself from the weight of responsibilities. If Ali is the leader by textual appointment, his appointing of other men is also denying the right of leadership and he will become an adviser to another unjust person, thus selling his Hereafter for the life of this world. Such a thing cannot be committed by someone who fears Allah and is looking for a way to absolve himself from blame.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITISIZED ABUBAKAR FOR NOT GOING OUT FOR CAMPAIGN UNDER USAMA

The Rafidi stated: “The Prophet (s.a.w) said while he is in his terminal illness again and again: ‘Dispatch the army of Usama! May Allah curse whoever stayed back from travelling with his army.’ The three are in his army and Abubakar prevented Umar from travelling with the army.”

We reply thus: This is a lie that has been agreed upon as a lie by all those who have knowledge of history. Nobody has reported that Abubakar and Uthman are in the army of Usama, but it has been reported that Umar is part of that army.

How can the Prophet (s.a.w) send Abubakar with the army of Usama while he has appointed him to lead people in prayers throughout the period of his illness? – For twelve days until he died – And nobody lead the Muslims in prayer other than Abubakar – by concurrent sound reports and narrations! – And Abubakar did not lead Muslims in one or two prayers or for one or two days, so that one may think about what Shia Rafida are mentioning of ambiguities or that Aisha appointed him (her father) without his (the Prophet’s) command and directives. Nay, he (Abubakar) has been praying with them throughout the period of the Prophet’s illness.

Muslims scholars have agreed upon the fact that the Prophet (s.a.w) did not lead the companions in prayers throughout the period of his sickness and that throughout that period it is Abubakar who has been leading the Muslims in prayers (for many days). The least that has been said is that he prayed with them seventeen prayers: He prayed with them the late night prayer (Isha prayer) on Friday night and he delivered the Friday prayer sermon on Friday. This is what has been concurrently reported by sound hadiths, and he continued praying with them up to the morning of Monday, when he prayed the Morning Prayer with them. On that day the Prophet (s.a.w) opened the curtain and saw them praying behind Abubakar. When they saw him they were about to be put in to trial in their prayer and he

returned the curtain and that was the last time they saw him alive. He died on Monday when the down become intense; very close to the appearance of the sun in the morning.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT THE PROPHET NEVER APPOINT ABUBAKAR TO ANY POSITION OF AUTHORITY

The Rafidi stated: “The Prophet (s.a.w) never appoint Abubakar to discharge any duty during his life time. Nay he appointed over him ‘Amr bin ‘As at a time and Usama at another time. When he sent him to announce the Chapter Nine of the Qur’an, he asked him to come back after three days through revelation from Allah. Then how can any rational person accept the leadership of a person who is not accepted by the Prophet (s.a.w) through revelation from Allah to convey ten verses of the Ninth Chapter of the Qur’an?”

We reply that: This is one of the clearest lies, for it is well known concurrently by the scholars of the exegesis of the Qur’an, history, war campaigns, hadith and jurisprudence etc. that the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed Abubakar to lead the pilgrims for the pilgrimage; and that was the first pilgrimage to be led from Madina and there wasn’t any pilgrimage before it in Islam, except the pilgrimage that was led by Attab bin Usaid bin Abi ‘As bin Umayyah from Makka. Makka was conquered in the eighth year and Attab bin Usaid who was appointed by the Prophet (s.a.w) as the governor of Makka led the pilgrimage that year. In the ninth year, the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed Abubakar to lead the pilgrims for the pilgrimage, after he comes back from the battle of Tabuk. Among the things the Prophet (s.a.w) asked Abubakar to do is to announce during the pilgrimage that: After that year, no polytheist will be allowed to attend the pilgrimage and no naked person shall circumambulate the Ka’abah again. The Prophet (s.a.w) never appoints anybody to this type of responsibility except Abubakar: The appointments of Abubakar are exclusive to him only; the Prophet (s.a.w) never appoints anybody to lead the pilgrimage other than Abubakar and he never appoints anybody to lead prayers other than Abubakar. Ali bin Abi Talib is among his subjects during that pilgrimage. When Ali bin Abi Talib reached Makka, he went to Abubakar in order to inform his leader about his mission, on seeing him Abubakar asked him: “Are you a

leader or a follower?" Ali replied: "Nay, I am a follower." Ali used to pray behind Abubakar together with the rest of the Muslims under his leadership and he used to listen to him and obey him, the way the rest of the Muslims listen to him and obey him. Ali and other people made the announcement during the pilgrimage of that year by the directives of Abubakar. It was recorded by Muslim that: Abu Huraira (Allah be pleased with him) reported: ***"Abubakar Siddiq (Allah be pleased with him) sent me during Hajj before the Farewell Pilgrimage for which Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) had appointed him an Amir (leader), among a group of people whom he had ordered to make announcement to the people on the Day of Nahr (sacrifice):" After this year no polytheist may perform the Pilgrimage and no naked person may circumambulate the House." Ibn Shihab stated that Humaid bin Abd al-Rahman said that according to this narration of Abu Huraira (Allah be pleased with him) the day of Hajj al-Akbar (Great Hajj) is this Day of Nahr (10th of Dhu'l-Hijja)" (Muslim).***

The appointments of people other than Abubakar has been shared by other men; that is other people have been given similar appointment, like the appointment of Ali and other people (over Madina or as a leader of army detachment etc.). Ali never get an appointment without somebody being given similar appointment (either before him or after him), in contrast to Abubakar for all his appointments are his exclusive virtues. In addition to that Abubakar has never been placed under the command of those mentioned; he was neither placed under the command of Usama nor 'Amr bin 'As (as claimed the Rafidah). Thus making Usama his commander is a lie by the consensus of scholars.

With regard to the story of 'Amr bin 'As; he was appointed by the Prophet (s.a.w) as a leader of a detachment in which is known as the campaign of Dhat as-Salasil. The campaign was directed to Banu 'Uzra who are the in laws of 'Amr bin 'As and he was made the leader perchance he can be able to convince them to embrace Islam. The Prophet (s.a.w) sent an additional reinforcement which included Abu Ubaidah, Abubakar, Umar and other companions from

among the Muhajirun and he commanded them to cooperate with each other and not to differ. When Abu Ubaidah reached 'Amr bin 'As he said to him: "I will lead my party in prayer and you lead your own party." 'Amr said: "No I will lead all the two parties for you are sent to me as reinforcement. Abu Ubaidah said to him: "The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) commanded me to cooperate with you, so if you disobey me, I will obey you." 'Amr bin 'As said: "I disobeyed you." Abubakar advised Abu Ubaidah to cooperate with him for the success of the mission. Thereafter, they used to pray behind 'Amr bin 'As, although everybody knew that Abubakar, Umar and Abu Ubaidah are better than him.

With regard to what the Rafidid stated: "(The Prophet) sent him with Chapter Nine of the Qur'an and asked him to come back after three days."

The above statement is a well-known lie and everybody knew that it is a lie. What happened is that the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed Abubakar to lead the pilgrimage that year – the ninth year after migration – and he did not went back to Madina until after finishing the pilgrimage rights and rituals and he has executed all what the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded him to do. The polytheist used to attend the pilgrimage and they used to circumambulate the Ka'abah naked. And there have been between the Prophet (s.a.w) and the polytheist some agreements and covenants between the Prophet (s.a.w) and the polytheists of Makka, so he asked Abubakar to announce in Makka that: No polytheists shall attend pilgrimage after this year and nobody shall circumambulate the Ka'abah naked. Abubakar selected some people and asked them to make the announcement that year and Ali bin Abi Talib is one of them.

What has happened is that after Abubakar has travelled to Makka together with the pilgrims from Madina, the Prophet (s.a.w) sent Ali after him in order to nullify the agreement that is between him and the polytheists. It is the custom of the Arabs that nobody sign an agreement or cancel it except the leader or a member of his household and that is why he sent Ali in order to cancel the agreement that has been entered into with the polytheist and he did

not send him to do anything other than that. That is why Ali used to pray behind Abubakar and follows his leadership in performing all rituals of the pilgrims like all other subjects of Abubakar that are performing the pilgrimage with him.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR CUT THE LEFT HAND OF A THIEF

The Rafidi stated: “He (Abubakar) cut the left hand of a thief due to ignorance that it is the right hand that shall be cut.”

We reply: Whoever say that Abubakar is ignorant of this issue, is telling a very clear lie. If he has said that, he used to prefer cutting the left hand over the right hand, his words might be a bit acceptable because there is nothing in the apparent text of the Qur’an that stated that the right hand shall be cut, with the exception of the recitation of Ibn Mas’ud, which stated: “Cut their right hands,” and this is the practice according to Sunnah.

We are asking: Where is the narration which stated that Abubakar cut the right hand of a thief? Where is the sound, reliable chain of authority? Here before us are the books of hadiths of all the scholars and there is nothing like that mentioned therein and none of the scholars on issues that have been differed (contentious matters) has mentioned anything like that although they all honor Abubakar (take and report his words).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED ABUBAKAR FOR BURNING MUSLIMS

The Rafidi stated: “He burnt Fuja’ah al-Aslami with fire and the prophet (s.a.w) has prohibited burning people with fire.”^[124]

We reply: Burning people is well known with regard to the conduct of Ali than the conduct of Abubakar. It has been narrated by Narrated 'Ikrima (r.a), who said: Some Zanadiqa (atheists from the Shia extremists) were brought to 'Ali and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn 'Abbas who said, ***‘If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as Allah's Apostle forbade it, saying, 'Do not punish anybody with Allah's punishment (fire).’ I would have killed them according to the statement of Allah's Apostle, 'Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him’” (Bukhari).*** When his comment reached Ali he said: ***“Oh! May Allah forgive the mother of Ibn Abbas.”***

Thus Ali has burnt a number of people with fire, so if what Abubakar has done is objectionable, then what Ali has done is more objectionable and if what Ali has done is not of the things that can be objected against leaders, then Abubakar deserved more not to be objected to.

SEGMENT: CLAIMS OF RAFIDI THAT ABUBAKAR IS IGNORANT OF THE LAWS

The Rafidi stated: “He (Abubakar) does not know much of the Shari’ah laws to the extent that he does not know the provision of the law concerning Kalalah (those who leave neither descendants nor ascendants as heirs). He said: ‘I will judge concerning it with my opinion, if it is right, then that is from Allah, and if it is a mistake, then that is from myself and from Satan.’ It is because of that that he gave the inheritance of Kalalah seventy times to grandfathers.”

We reply: This is one of the greatest slanders. How can Abubakar be ignorant of most of the Shari’ah laws while he is the only one (among the companions) that judges and give religious verdicts in the presence the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) (and by his permission)? And there is nobody who the Prophet (s.a.w) consult on issues more than him and nobody is closer to him to the Prophet (s.a.w), followed by Umar.

Many scholars such as Abdujjabar al-Sa’ani have reported that there is a consensus of scholars that Abubakar is the most knowledgeable in the Islamic community. This is a very clear fact, because the Islamic community never differed on an issue except that he explained it to them with knowledge and supports what he advanced with proofs from the Qur’an and Sunnah. Such as the way he explained to them the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) and asked them to be steadfast in faith; he read to them verses of the Qur’an (and calmed them). He informed them the place where the Prophet (s.a.w) is to be buried. He explained to them the necessity of fighting those who refused to give Zakat when Umar has some doubt about it and it is he who informed them that leadership of the Islamic community is in the Quraish at Thaqifa of Bani Sa’adah when some of them (some of the Ansar) thought that it can be in other than them.

The Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed him to lead the first pilgrimage from Madina and the knowledge of the rituals of the pilgrimage is one of the most sensitive sciences in worships (observances), and if

he is not well versed in it, he will not have appointed him. The Prophet (s.a.w) also appointed him to lead prayer and if he knows that he is not versed and knowledgeable in it, he would not have appointed him. The prophet (s.a.w) never appointed anyone else to lead pilgrimage and prayers other than him.^[125] The book of Zakat which the Prophet (s.a.w) obligated upon the believers was taken by Anas bin Malik from Abubakar and it is the most sound and reliable knowledge upon which all the jurists depended on that science.

Summarily, one religious verdict or judgment in which Abubakar make a mistake is never known, while a lot of mistakes have reported concerning other people.

The Rafidi sated: "He does not know the religious verdict on Kalalah." We reply that: This is one of his greatest knowledge because the opinion he gave concerning it has been agreed upon by the generality of the scholars after him: They have taken the knowledge of Kalalah from Abubakar; he (Kalalah), is the person who died without leaving a child or father.

The method of using opinion to give religious verdict is employed by all the Prophet's companions, such as Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Ibn Mas'ud, Zaid bin Thabit and Mu'az bin Jabal; but the opinion that agreed with the truth, is the one that confer two recompenses to the one who made it, like the opinion of Abubakar; it is better than the opinion of the one whose utmost limit is to deserve one recompense.

Qais bin Ubbad said to Ali: ***"This, your travel (to Iraq); are you commanded to do it by the Prophet (s.a.w) or is it just an opinion that you see? He replied: May, it is an opinion that I see" (Abu Dawud).*** Undoubtedly, this type of opinion that leads to war and spilling of blood does not inhibit the one who hold it from becoming a leader let alone an opinion upon which all scholars have agreed and accepted as sound and perfect. What the Rafidi mentioned that Abubakar gave seventy verdicts concerning the grandfather on Kalalah is nothing but a lie. It is never an opinion of Abubakar and nobody has narrated that he said it; nay whoever stated that Abubakar has given such a verdict is only showing his extreme ignorance, his lies, and his fabrications.

SEGMENT: ON RAFIDA'S PREFERENCE OF ALI OVER ABUBAKAR

The Rafidi stated: "How can you compare him with the one who said: 'Ask me before you lose me, ask me about the revelations for I knew it more than the earth sciences.' Abul Bakhtari said: I saw Ali on the pulpit in Kufa, wearing the coat of mail of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), hanging the prophet's sword, wearing the Prophet's turban and wearing the Prophet's ring. He sat on the pulpit and opened his stomach and then said: Ask me before you lose me for I have a lot of knowledge. This is the container of knowledge, these are the saliva of the Prophet (s.a.w) and with me is what the Prophet (s.a.w) taught me without receiving revelation myself. I swear by Allah if a pillow is placed for me and I sat on it, I can give verdicts to the Jews with Torah (Old Testament) and give verdict to the Christians with Injil (New Testament) to the extent that Allah will make the Torah and the Injil speak and say: Ali has spoken the truth, he has surely, informed you what Allah has revealed in us and you people are reading the book: Don't you have sense?"

We reply thus: When Ali said: "Ask me before you lose me," he was speaking to the people of Kufa; so that he can impart upon them knowledge and teach them their religion. This is because most of the people of Kufa are ignorant and they did not meet the prophet (s.a.w). In contrast to Abubakar, for those who are around his pulpit are the grand companions of the Prophet (r.a) who have taken knowledge and religion directly from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and thus, the subjects of Abubakar are the most religious and the most knowledgeable of the Islamic community. Those who Ali is facing and speaking to are the generality of the masses that follows him and most of them are evil followers and that is why he always criticizes them and supplicate to Allah against them.^[126] Those who are the followers and students of other companions in Makka, Madina, Syria and Basra are better than them (the party or companions of Ali in Kufa).

Scholars have gathered and compiled issues related to judgments and religious verdicts that were given by Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali and they found the most correct of them and the ones that showed the knowledge of the one delivering them the most are the ones given by Abubakar, followed by those of Umar. And that is why religious verdicts that are found to contradict a text that are credited to Umar are less than what was credited to Ali, in contrast to Abubakar for you will almost not find any verdict he gave contradicting any text. Abubakar used to explain to the companions matters that are ambiguous to them to the extent that during his time there are no known difference of opinion among them and most of the differences in laws and verdict come up after him.

The hadith that the Rafidi mentioned is a clear lie against Ali and such a statement shall not be ascribed to people like him, this is because he knew Allah and he is well versed in the religion of Allah and thus, he is above and absolved from giving judgment with Torah and Injil. Muslims have agreed upon the fact that it is prohibited for any Muslim to judge anybody except with what Allah has revealed in the Qur'an. And if the Jews or Christians bring a case to be determined by a Muslim it is not permitted for any Muslim to judge them with anything other than what Allah has revealed in the Qur'an. Since it is well known through the Qur'an, Sunnah and the consensus of all Muslims that a Muslim judge is not allowed to judge except with what Allah has revealed to Muhammad (s.a.w), whether that judgment agrees with what is in the Torah and Injil or not. Then, whoever ascribed to Ali that he is judging Jews and Christians with their religious books or that he is giving them religious verdicts with their religious books, in order to praise him with that; he must be either one of most ignorant men with religion of Islam and with what he shall praise the one he loves or one of the atheists unbelievers who want to disparage Ali with that statement. It is a statement with which disparagement and punishment are deserved and earned instead of praise and recompense.

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE FALSE HADITH OF RAFIDI ON THE VIRTUES OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “Baihaqi narrated with its chain of authority that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘Whoever want to look at Adam in his knowledge, Noah in his fear of Allah, Abraham in his patience, Moses in his dignity and Jesus in his devotion, shall look at Ali bin Abi Talib.’ Thus, he has joined in him all their characteristics.”

We reply: Firstly: Where is the chain of authority of this hadith? Baihaqi recorded weak, nay fabricated narrations on virtues (of the prophet’s companions), as was the custom of other than him among the scholars.

Secondly: Without any doubt this hadith is a fabricated lie against the prophet (s.a.w) and for this reason scholars of hadith do not mention it in their works although they ardently want to compile the virtues of Ali. For instance, Nisa’i has compiled the virtues of Ali in a book titled “al-Khasa’is,” and Tirmidhi has mentioned many hadiths on his virtues (in his Sunan), which are a mixture of (the sound), the weak and the fabricated, but those scholars never mention this one and others that are similar to it.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR AND UMAR WERE OVERWHELMED BY ALI'S KNOWLEDGE

The Rafidi stated: "Umar az-Zahid said: Abul Abbas Tha'alab said: We never know anybody who said after his Prophet: 'Ask me,' from the time of Prophet Sheeth (or Seth) to the time of Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) except Ali. The grand companions such as Abubakar and Umar asked him until they were overwhelmed and they have nothing more to ask. Then he said O kumail bin Ziyad! There is a lot of knowledge in me, so why do not you take some of it?"

We reply: Even if this quotation is soundly stated by Abul Abbas Tha'alab; he has not mentioned any chain of authority so that it can be used as a proof and Tha'alab is not among the scholars of hadith who knew its sound, its weak and its fabricated so that one can claim that it is sound according to him, just like if Ahmad, or Yahya bin Mu'in or Bukhari etc. say that. Nay among the jurists there are those who are more knowledgeable than Tha'alab who are mentioning many hadiths that have no basis let alone Tha'alab? He just heard this from some people who are not mentioning those from whom they are quoting.

Ali never used to say this in Madina,^[127] neither in the time of Abubakar, nor in the periods Umar and Uthman, but he used to say that during his time in Kufa so that he can teach those people what they did not know of their religion because they are defective and sluggish in searching for knowledge. Thus, Ali is commanding them and encouraging them to search for knowledge and to ask questions.

The hadith of Kumail bin Ziyad is indicating what we have mentioned for Kumail is one of the Tabi'un that accompanied him in Kufa and this showed that he is seeing their defects in seeking for knowledge and he never make this type of statement to the Muhajirun and Ansar, nay he greatly praises them and extol their virtues.

With regard to Abubakar; it shall be known that he never ask Ali anything, but Umar used to consult the prophet's companions such as, Uthman, Ali, Abdurrahman bin 'Auf, Abdullah bin Mas'ud, Zaid bin Thabit etc., and Ali is among his consultative assembly.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ACCUSED ABUBAKAR FOR NOT PUNISHING KHALID BIN WALID

The Rafidi stated: “He (Abubakar) neglected the bounds of Allah by not applying legal punishment on Khalid bin Walid for killing Malik bin Nuwairah, who is a Muslim and he married his wife in the night that he killed him and consummated the marriage. Umar advised him to kill him but he refused.”

We reply thus: If abandoning applying legal punishment against those who killed a Muslim in cold blood are among the things that are objected against leaders; then this is the greatest valid reason for the party of Uthman against Ali. This is because Uthman is better than Malik bin Nuwairah and he was the leader of the Muslims; he was killed in cold blood, a martyred without any valid reason or excuse. Ali did not kill those who killed Uthman and this is the greatest reason why the party of Uthman refused to give him vow of allegiance. If Ali has any legal justification for not killing the murderers of Uthman; then the justifications of Abubakar for not killing the killer of Malik bin Nuwairah are stronger and if he has no excuse for doing that, then it is more deserved that Ali has no excuse for leaving the murderers of Uthman. What the Shia Rafidah are doing of objecting to Abubakar in this small issue and not objecting against Ali (on that great issue) showed their extreme ignorance and extreme contradiction. Their objection that Uthman did not kill Ubaidullah bin Umar for killing Hurmuzan, is similar to this case.

If someone says: Ali is defensible for not killing the murderers of Uthman, because the right situation and condition for carrying out the punishment are not available; either because those who killed him are not identified in persons or he is unable to do so because they are very strong (and are backed by their tribes) etc.! It will be replied that the condition of carrying out legal punishment on the killer of Malik bin Nuwairah and the killer of Hurmuzan are also not available due to the existence of some ambiguities with regard to

that and according to laws; punishments are lifted due to ambiguities.

If it said that Umar has advised Abubakar to kill Khalid bin Walid and Ali has advised Uthman to kill Ubaidullah bin Umar! It will be replied that: Talha, Zubair and other companions have advised Ali to kill the murderers of Uthman. Those who advised Abubakar to kill Khalid, were convinced by him with clear proofs and justifications which they accepted either because they have realized that the truth is with him or because they understood that it is an issue that is justified by Ijtihad. With regard to Ali: He did not agree with those who advised him to kill the murderers of Uthman to the extent that war took place between him and them; and this is a known fact. Applying legal punishment on those who killed Uthman would have been lighter than what took place in the battles of the Camel and Siffin; so if this is Ijtihad, then the former cases more deserved to be accepted as Ijtihad.

If it said that spilling the blood of Uthman is right. it will be replied that: There is no doubt in anybody's mind about the permissibility of killing Malik bin Nuwairah is more apparent than the permissibility of killing Uthman; nay nobody knows that the blood of Malik bin Nuwairah is sacred, no one can prove that he does not deserve to be killed. This in contrast to the blood of Uthman, for his blood is concurrently certified and affirmed to be sacred by texts of the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w); differences between Uthman and Malik bin Nuwairah are uncountable.

Whoever said that shedding the blood of Uthman is permitted cannot be able to make the blood of Ali or Husain sacred for the sacredness of the blood of Uthman is clearer than the sacredness of the blood of Ali and Husain. Uthman is also freer from the ambiguities of being killed than Ali and Husain, because the ambiguities of those who killed Uthman are weaker and more flimsy than the ambiguities of those who killed Ali and Husain; this is because Uthman did not fight anybody over power and authority and he absolutely never seek to fight anybody over his authority. Therefore, if it is imperative to say; blood of the person who killed many Muslims over his authority is

sacred, and that he is a Mujtahid in what he does! Then to say that Uthman's blood is sacred and that he is a Mujtahid in his administration of the State treasury and his appointment of governors is more deserved and more right.

And then we say: The extreme limit that is said about Malik bin Nuwairah is that his blood is sacred and that Khalid bin Walid killed him by some interpretations and such an action (that is based on Ijtihad) does not permit killing Khalid (in retribution). For instance when Usama bin Zaid killed a man who declared that he has embraced Islam in a state of war, the Prophet (s.a.w) objected strongly against his action but he did not obligate upon him slaughter for retaliation and neither payment of blood money, nor any expiation of sin. In the sound hadith it is reported thus: ***"It is narrated on the authority of Usama bin Zaid: The Messenger of Allah may peace be upon him) sent us to Huraqat, a tribe of Juhaina. We attacked that tribe early in the morning and defeated them and I and a man from the Ansar caught hold of a person (of the defeated tribe). When we overcame him, he said: There is no god but Allah. At that moment the Ansari spared him, but I attacked him with my spear and killed him. The news had already reached the Apostle (peace be upon him), so when we came back he (the Apostle) said to me: Usama, did you kill him after he had made the profession: There is no god but Allah? I said. Messenger of Allah, he did it only as a shelter. The Holy Prophet observed: Did you kill him after he had made the profession that there is no god but Allah? He (the Holy Prophet) went on repeating this to me till I wished I had not embraced Islam before that day"*** (Muslim, Abu Dawud).

In another version: "He (the Holy Prophet) observed: Did you tear his heart in order to find out whether it had professed or not?" (Muslim).

What he mentioned about marrying his wife and consummating the marriage in the night that her husband was killed, is not something that has been reported by any reliable source and if what he (the Rafidi) stated is sound, there should have been interpretations and

or justifications that bared the execution of the law of adultery on him. Scholars have differed on the issue of waiting period of a woman after the death of her husband; is it compulsory to observe it on an unbeliever? They have two opinions on this issue. They also differed on whether it is obligatory on a non-Muslim woman under the protection of the Islamic State to observe waiting period. They have two well-known opinions on this issue too. This in contrast to the waiting period of divorce which must be observed in order to make sure that the womb is free from pregnancy. The waiting period for a dead husband is obligated by marriage contract; so if he died before consummating the marriage, can there be any waiting period for an unbeliever or not? They differed on this issue. They also differed on if he has consummated the marriage. These rules are in relation to the person who is in essence an unbeliever. With regard to the person who has apostate from Islam and he was killed or he died upon apostasy; the opinion of Imams Shafi'i, Ahmad, Abu Yusuf and Muhammad is that there is no waiting period of death upon his wife, but waiting period of irrevocable divorce because the marriage has been abrogated by the husbands apostasy. Abrogation or nullification of a marriage is not considered a divorce by Imams Malik and Abu Hanifa and that is why they did not obligate upon her the waiting period of irrevocable divorce. In this case if the husband did not consummate the marriage, there is no waiting period for her, just as there is no waiting period upon divorce of a marriage that has not been consummated.

It is well known that Khalid bin Walid killed Malik bin Nuwairah because according to his evaluation, he is an apostate and if he has not consummated the marriage with his wife, there is no waiting period for her in accordance to the generality of Muslim scholars. And if he has consummated the marriage, the waiting period is just one menstruation, in accordance to one of their opinions. If the obligation for her is to just make one menstruation; may be she has already done so, because among the scholars there are those who said that even a partial menstruation shows that the woman is not

pregnant and if he has married her at the last phase of her menstruation, it is considered that she is free from pregnancy.

Summarily we do not know whether the issue has occurred in such a way that Ijtihad is untenable and criticizing this type of case is only done by a person who is talking without knowledge, and such a conduct has been forbidden by Allah and his Messenger (s.a.w).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITISIZED ABUBAKAR ON INHERITANCE OF FATIMA AND BEING NAMED AS CALIPH

The Rafidi stated: “He (Abubakar) contravened the command of the Prophet (s.a.w) for his refusal to give his daughter her inheritance. He refused to give to her Fadak property and he called himself the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w) without being appointed by him.”

We reply that: With regard to the issue of inheritance; all Muslims (except some Shia) are with Abubakar. This has been explained already and it has been proven with sound knowledge from the Prophet (s.a.w) that what Shia are claiming, is absolutely false. The same thing with what he has mentioned concerning the issue of Fadak; the opinion of Abubakar on it is the opinion of all the Caliphs after him. Abubakar and Umar did not benefit with anything from Fadak or any landed property, they did not give anything from it to their families and they gave to Bani Hashim what is more than Fadak manifold.

If somebody said that Ali refused to give Ibn Abbas and some Bani Hashim anything from the Muslim treasury to the extent that Ibn Abbas took some money from the treasury of Basra and went away with it; the only justification we can give to Ali is that he is a leader whose goal is the truth and justice. This reply is more deserved as a right concerning Abubakar; his love for Fatima and his taking care of her rights is greater for the love of Ali for Ibn Abbas. The case of Ibn Abbas with Ali is very similar with the case of Fatima with Abubakar, for surely the grace of Abubakar to Fatima is greater than the grace of Ali to Ibn Abbas.

With regard to the issue of calling Abubakar the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w): Know that it is the Muslims who gave him that title. Therefore, if a successor is the one who has been appointed by a leader – as claimed by this Rafidi – then the prophet (s.a.w) is the one who appointed him; in accordance to the opinion of those who are saying that among the Ahlus Sunnah. And if a successor is the one who come after the past leader even if he did not appoint him,

as the opinion of the generality of the Muslims; then this does not need appointment by the past leader. The existing usage of the word in the Qur'an and Sunnah encompasses whoever succeeded another person whether that person has appointed him or not. Allah said: **"Then We made you successors after them, generations after generations in the land, that We might see how you would work!" (10:14).**

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR OVER WHAT HE SAID WHEN HE WAS ABOUT TO DIE

The Rafidi stated: “Among that is what has been narrated by Hafiz bin Nu’aim in his book ‘Hilyatul Awliy’a.’ When Umar is about to die he said: ‘I wish that I am a ram for my people, so that they fattened me as they like and when their most beloved guest come to them, they slaughter me for him, after that they roast half of me and dry half of me. Then they eat me and I am excreted instead of being a human being.’ Is this not similar to what the unbelievers will say in the Hereafter: “... **Woe to me! Would that I were dust?**” (78:40). And Ibn Abbas said when he is about to die: ‘if I have gold full of the earth and another one like it, I will ransom myself from the advancing fearful event.’ This is just like what is said to the unbelievers in the Hereafter: “**And those who did wrong (the polytheists and disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah), if they had all that is in earth and therewith as much again, they verily, would offer it to ransom themselves therewith on the Day of Resurrection from the evil torment, and there will become apparent to them from Allah, what they had not been reckoning**” (39:47). Therefore, let the just, fair minded, intelligent person assess the words of the two men when they are about to die and what Ali said: ‘When will I meet the beloved, Muhammad and his party, when will I die and when will the damned be brought to life?’ And he said when Ibn Muljam stabbed him: ‘I have won by the lord of the Ka’abah!’”

We reply as follows: This statement contained ignorance and it showed the extreme ignorance of the person who made it. This is because what he has mentioned with regard to Ali, have been stated by people who are below the status of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali; nay similar statements have been made by people who are ascribing Ali to apostasy among the Kharijites. Such statements were made by Bilal, who was liberated by Abubakar when he was about to die and his wife is wailing and moaning: ‘Woe to us!’ While he is saying: ‘O my happiness! Tomorrow I will meet the beloved Muhammad and his party.’ Before then, Umar has prayed against them, when they opposed him on the issue of land distribution,

saying: "O Allah! Suffice me against Bilal and his companions." And before the year end none of them is alive.

Abu Nu'aim narrated in his book al-Hilya: From Qutai'i, from Hasan bin Abdullah, from Amir bin Yassar, from Abdulhamid bin Bihran, from Shahr bin Haushab, from Abdurrahman bin Ghanam, from Harith bin 'Umair, who said: Mu'az, Abu Ubaidah, Shurahbil bin Hasanah and Malik bin 'Ash'ariy were stabbed on the same day (during a war). Mu'az said: "This is a mercy for you, the prayer of your Prophet (s.a.w) and the path of believers before you: O Allah, bestow upon the family of Mu'az a greater portion of this mercy." Before the day passed his son Abdurrahman, who is the most beloved to him was stabbed. When he went back from the mosque he found him distressed. He said to him: 'O Abdurrahman, how are you feeling?' He replied: 'O my father the truth is from your Lord, so do not be among those who doubt it.' He replied: 'By the Will of Allah, you will find me among the patient'" (Hilyatul Awliya). When Mu'az was stabbed and when the throes of death became intense upon him, he said: "My Lord strangle me with mighty choking, for I understand You and You knew that my heart loves You" (hilyatul Awliya).

With regard to his words: "I won, by the Lord of the Ka'abah." Similar statement was made by people less than Ali in status, for 'Amir bin Fuhairah the client of Abubakar as-Siddiq has said it on the day he was killed at Bi'ir Ma'unah. That was when the Prophet (s.a.w) sent him with an army detachment towards Najad. The scholars of history said he was stabbed by Jabbar bin Salma and thus killing him. 'Amir said: "By Allah I have won." Jabbar asked: "What does he mean by Allah I have won!" 'Urwah bin Zubair said: "They believe that the Angels attended his burial." When Shubaib the Kharijite was stabbed he stated saying: "I come to You quickly my Lord so that You will be pleased." And I (Ibn Taimiyyah) knew a man, among our companions, who when he is about to die he repeatedly says: "O my beloved I have come to You," until he died. There are many instances of these cases.

With regard to Umar bin Khattab, his display of fear of Allah is due to his perfect knowledge. Allah said: **"...It is only those who have knowledge among His slaves that fear Allah. Verily, Allah is All-Mighty, Oft-Forgiving" (35:28)**. The prophet (s.a.w) used to pray and in his chest there is a sound like that of boiling caldron from weeping (Nisai'i, Ahmad).

With regard to the statement of the Rafidi: Is this not similar to what unbelievers will say: **"... Woe to me! Would that I were dust?" (78:40)**. This statement showed his ignorance, because the unbelievers will say that in the Hereafter where repentance is not acceptable and good works do not benefit. In contrast to the person who said that in this world, for he is saying that in the home of good deeds out of fear of his Lord and he will be recompensed for his act of piety. Mary the mother of Jesus has said: **"...Would that I had died before this, and had been forgotten and out of sight!" (19:23)**. And this is not like wishing for death in the Hereafter. This statement cannot be made the same as that of the denizens of Hell Fire, such as: **"And they will cry: "O Malik (Keeper of Hell)! Let your Lord make an end of us..." (43:77)**. And cannot be made similar to the words of Allah: **"And those who did wrong (the polytheists and disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah), if they had all that is in earth and therewith as much again, they verily, would offer it to ransom themselves therewith on the Day of Resurrection from the evil torment, and there will become apparent to them from Allah, what they had not been reckoning" (39:47)**. These are information about their conditions in the Hereafter, where repentance and fear of Allah are not beneficial. This is in contrast to the life of this world; if a slave of Allah fears his Lord, He will recompense him for that, and whoever fears Allah in this world, Allah will provide him with security in the Hereafter.

Whoever made fear of a believer in this world like the fear of an unbeliever in the Hereafter is like the person who said that darkness is the same as light, shade is the same as intense heat of the sun and the dead are the same as the living.

SEGMENT: STATEMENT ON THE DOCUMENT THE PROPHET WANTED TO WRITE WHILE HE WAS TERMINALLY ILL

He Rafidi stated: “The scholars of the six sound books of hadiths narrated from the Musnad of Ibn Abbas, that the Prophet (s.a.w) said before his death: ‘Bring to me ink and paper so that I write for you a document by which you will not go astray after me.’ Umar said: ‘He is speaking out of the pain of sickness; the Book of Allah is enough for us.’ There was much argument and the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘Go out! You shall not argue before me.’ Ibn Abbas said: ‘It was a big disaster, that which stood between us and the document of the Prophet (s.a.w).’ Umar said: ‘Muhammad (s.a.w) did not die and he will not die until he cut the hands and legs of some men.’ When Abubakar asked him to stop making such statements and he read out to them: **“Verily, you (O Muhammad) will die and verily, they (too) will die” (39:30).** And the words of Allah: **“Muhammad (SAW) is no more than a Messenger, and indeed (many) Messengers have passed away before him. If he dies or is killed, will you then turn back on your heels (as disbelievers)? And he who turns back on his heels, not the least harm will he do to Allah, and Allah will give reward to those who are grateful” (3:144).** He said as if I never heard these verses.”

We reply thus: The knowledge of Umar and his virtues are known by all (fair minded persons) and his knowledge and virtues are only exceeded by those of Abubakar (from among all the companions). In a sound hadith on the authority Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, ***“Amongst the people preceding you there used to be ‘Muhaddithun’ (i.e. persons who can guess things that come true later on, as if those persons have been inspired by a divine power), and if there are any such persons amongst my followers, it is ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab” (Bukhari).*** In another hadith, Aisha said, the Prophet (s.a.w) used to say: ***“In the communities that passed before you, there used to be Muhaddithun, if there is any of them in my community it will be Umar” (Bukhari,***

Muslim). In a version in Bukhari the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“In the past among the Banu Isra’il there are men who speak without being prophets, so if they exist among my community, it is Umar.”***

In a sound hadith Ibn `Umar narrated that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“While I was asleep I saw a container brought with milk, I drank from it until I saw satiation flowing in my nails, and then I passed it to `Umar.’ They said, ‘How did you interpret it, Messenger of Allah?’ He said: ‘Knowledge’”*** In another sound hadith Abu Sa’id al-Khudri said: I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying, ***“While I was sleeping I saw people being shown to me and they had shirts on. Some of them reached to the breast, and some of them reached lower than that. `Umar was shown to me and he had on a shirt which he was dragging along.’ They said, ‘How did you interpret it, Messenger of Allah?’ He said, ‘The deen (religion)’”*** (Bukhari, Muslim).

With regard to the document that the Prophet (s.a.w) want to write it has been explained as authoritatively stated in Bukhari and Muslim that Aisha said, the Prophet (s.a.w) said to her in his terminal illness: ***“Call Abubakar for me, your father and your brother, so that I may dictate a letter. For I am worried lest someone who is ambitious says that he is more entitled to the position of leadership, but Allah and the believers will not accept anyone other than Abubakar”*** (Muslim). In another hadith narrated by Qasim bin Muhammad: 'Aisha said, ***"O my head!" Allah's Apostle said, "If that (i.e., your death) should happen while I am still alive, I would ask Allah to forgive you and would invoke Allah for you."*** 'Aisha said, ***"O my life which is going to be lost! By Allah, I think that you wish for my death, and if that should happen then you would be busy enjoying the company of one of your wives in the last part of that day."*** The Prophet said, ***"But I should say, 'O my head!' I feel like calling Abu Bakr and his son and appoint (the former as my successors lest people should say something or wish for something. Allah will insist (on Abubakar becoming a Caliph) and the believers will prevent***

(anyone else from claiming the Caliphate)," or "...Allah will prevent (anyone else from claiming the Caliphate) and the believers will insist (on Abubakar becoming the Caliph" (Bukhari).

With regard to Umar: He falls into ambiguity; are the words of the Prophet (s.a.w) due to intensity of sickness or he is making a normal statement; and Prophets do fall sick (for they are human beings) and that is why he said: What is wrong with him? Is he speaking out of intense sickness? Thus, he doubted the condition and he was not sure whether he is speaking out of sickness and it is natural for Umar to fall into doubt, because nobody is infallible except the Prophet (s.a.w). And especially that he doubted due to ambiguity: the Prophet is sick and he does not know whether his words are due to the intensity of sickness as it used to happen to the sick or his words are normal statements that must be accepted. Umar also thought that he did not die until it was explained to him that he is dead.

The Prophet (s.a.w) has intended to write the document that has been mentioned by Aisha and when he saw that his companions have fallen into ambiguity and doubt, he understood that writing the document will not remove the ambiguity. Thus, it is no more beneficial and he knew that Allah will make them agree upon what he wanted to write, as he has said: ***"Allah and the believers will not agree but on Abubakar."***

With regard to the words of Ibn Abbas: ***"What prevented the Prophet (s.a.w) from writing the document is a calamity."*** This entailed that what prevented writing the document is a calamity and it is a calamity upon whoever doubted the successorship and Caliphate of Abubakar or falls into ambiguity regarding that issue, because if there is a written document the doubt would have been removed. As for the person who knew that the successorship and Caliphate of Abubakar is sound and right; he did not falls into any disaster. Thus, Glory be to Allah.

Whoever think that the document will be about the successorship of Ali is misguided, strayed from the right path by the consensus of the

generality of the people among the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. Ahlus Sunnah have agreed upon the precedence of Abubakar and preferring him (above anyone else). Shia who are saying that Ali deserved the Caliphate and they are saying that the Prophet (s.a.w) has already before that time, appointed Ali as his successor with clear texts and directives; if that is the case, there is no need for writing the document. If one say that: The Islamic community has rejected the textual directives. It will be replied that: It will be easier for a small party of men present at that time to hide a written document.

Again, according to Shia it is not allowed to delay explaining the successorship of Ali to the terminal illness of the Prophet (s.a.w) and it is not allowed for him to abandoned writing the document no matter who doubted. If what the Prophet (s.a.w) want to write is among what is obligatory upon him to do (by Allah), he would have explained it and write it without giving consideration to anybody's statement, for he is the most obedient servant of Allah. Therefore, it is known that he left the writing because writing it is not obligatory upon him and there is nothing of religious instructions that must be written at that time for if there is, he would have done so. [\[128\]](#)

If Umar has fallen into doubt concerning some things, then they became clear to him or he doubted some issues; then he is not greater than the person who gave verdicts or passed judgments on issues that the Prophet (s.a.w) has already given verdicts or passed judgment contrary to what he issued, through Ijtihad without knowing that the Prophet (s.a.w) has already given judgments contrary to his own. Surely doubting a fact is lighter than being certain in what is contrary to the truth. All these are permissible with sincere Ijtihad for they are mistakes that Allah has forgiven. For instance Ali gave a verdict concerning a pregnant woman whose husband has died by saying that, she shall observe the waiting period of the farthest time, although it come in a sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) was informed that Abu Sanabil has given a similar verdict concerning Subai'ah al-Aslamiyyah and he said: ***“Abu Sanabil has lied, nay you are free, marry whoever you like” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** A

version of the hadith read as follows: ***“Narrated Subai’ah bint Al-Harith: That she was married to Sad bin Khaula who was from the tribe of Bani ‘Amr bin Luai, and was one of those who fought the Badr battle. He died while she was pregnant during Hajjat-ul-Wada.’ Soon after his death, she gave birth to a child. When she completed the term of deliver (i.e. became clean), she prepared herself for suitors. Abu As-Sanabil bin Bu’kak, a man from the tribe of Bani Abd-ud-Dal called on her and said to her, “What! I see you dressed up for the people to ask you in marriage. Do you want to marry By Allah, you are not allowed to marry unless four months and ten days have elapsed (after your husband's death).” Subai’a in her narration said, “When he (i.e. Abu As-Sanabil) said this to me. I put on my dress in the evening and went to Allah's Apostle and asked him about this problem. He gave the verdict that I was free to marry as I had already given birth to my child and ordered me to marry if I wished” (Bukhari).*** Abu Sanabil is not among those who can make Ijtihad and he is not supposed to give such verdict in the presence of the Prophet (s.a.w). With regard to Ali and Ibn Abbas, they gave such verdicts because they are Msujtahids making Ijtihad after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the story of Subai’ah has not reached them.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI SLANDERED UMAR ON FATIMA AND ACCUSED HIM OF IMPEDING SHARI'AH

The Rafidi stated: "When Fatima preached to Abubakar concerning Fadak, he wrote a document, returning it to her. She left his presence and met Umar on the way who (collected and) burnt the document. She supplicated against him with what Abu Lu'u Lu'u did to him. He obstructed the law of Allah for not punishing Mughirah bin Shu'abah. He used to give the Prophet's wives provision from the state treasury, more than what is due to them. He used to give Aisha and Hafsa Ten Thousand Dirham every year. He changed the law of Allah on those who are exiled and he has little knowledge of the Islamic law."

We reply him thus: All these are lies that no scholar will doubt and nobody among the scholars of hadith mentioned them. The narrations he quoted have no chains of authority and Abubakar never bestow Fadak to anybody, neither to Fatima nor to any other person. Fatima never supplicated against Umar. What Abu Lu'u Lu'u has done was an honor in the right of Umar and it is greater than what Ibn Muljam has done to Ali and what the murderers of Husain has done to him. This is because Abu lu'u Lu'u is an unbeliever who killed Umar, the way an unbeliever kill a believer (in the path of Allah); and surely the one who is killed by an unbeliever has greater degree than the one who is killed by a Muslim (due to some ambiguities). Abu Lu'u Lu'u killed Umar after the death of Fatima and the period of the Caliphate of Abubakar.;Then how can it be known that the reason for his martyrdom is the prayer of Fatima against him? The person who prayed that an unbeliever shall kill a Muslim has prayed in his favor and not against him. The Prophet (s.a.w) used to pray for his companions with similar prayer, such as his words: ***"May Allah forgive so and so." They (the companions) will say: "we wish he remain with us."*** And whoever he prayed for with that prayer will be martyred (Bukhari, Muslim).

If somebody say: Ali has committed injustice against the people of Siffin and the Kharijites to the extent that they supplicated against him with what Ibn Muljam has done to him; this statement cannot be more irrational than that statement. The same could be said if somebody says: The family of Abu Sufyan bin Harb supplicated against Husain for what has happened to him.

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: "He obstructed the law of Allah, for not punishing Mughirah bin Shu'abah." The reply is: The generality of scholars have agreed with what Umar has done on the issue of Mughirah bin Shu'abah and that is, if evidence is not perfect, with complete witnesses; then whoever gives a different verdict cannot be challenged because his judgment will be based on Ijtihad. We have already mentioned that what is being objected to Ali for obstructing the law and not punishing those who murdered Uthman (in cold blood) is greater than this issue. If the person who is objecting against Ali is wrong, then what is objected against Umar is more wrong.

With regard to what the Rafidi stated: "He used to give the Prophet's wives provision from the state treasury, more than what is due to them. He used to give Aisha and Hafsa Ten Thousand Dirham every year." We reply that: He used to reduce what is given to Hafsa because she is his daughter, in the same way as he reduces the provision of Abdullah bin Umar. This is among his perfect precaution in doing justice, his fear of standing before his Lord and preventing himself from vain desires. His opinion is the application of the principle of preference in distributing state wealth on the basis of virtues. He used to give the prophet's wives more than he give to any other woman and he used to give Bani Hashim: the family of Ali, and the Family of Abbas more than he give to people from other tribes, and if he gives preference to a person he does so due to his relationship with the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) or due to his precedence in Islam or due to his deserving it by right. He used to say: "Nobody has more right concerning this wealth over anybody; it is a man with his self-sufficiency, a man by his effort, a man by his past records and a man by his needs." He never give preference to

whoever will cause him to be accused of nepotism among his friends and his near relatives, nay he used to reduce what is given to his daughter, his son and those similar to them. He used to give preference due to religious precedence only and he also preferred the household of the Prophet over all households and give them precedence.

This conduct has not been pursued by anybody after him, neither by Uthman nor by Ali or other than them. Therefore, if he is criticized for giving preference to the wives of the Prophet (s.a.w), then let him be criticized also for giving preference to some men of the Prophet's household and nay, giving them precedence over all people.

SEGMENT: ON THE SHIA RAFIDI'S CRITICISM OF UMAR FOR CHANGING THE LAW OF EXILE

The Rafidi stated: "He changed the law of Allah on those are exiled and he has little knowledge of the Islamic law."

We reply: Changing the law of Allah is done with what contradicted it, liked dropping what Allah has obligated and forbidding what Allah has allowed. Exiling a person for drinking wine is a form of reprimand in which Ijtihad is allowed for the Prophet (s.a.w) has not determined its legal punishment; neither in extent nor in specification. This is because he allowed on it beating with shoes, tips of clothes, palm-leaf stalk etc., while beating on the application of the punishment on slander and illegal sexual intercourse is done with whip. In a hadith: Narrated Abdullah Ibn Abbas: ***"The Prophet (s.a.w) did not prescribe any punishment for drinking wine. Ibn Abbas said: A man who had drunk wine and become intoxicated was found staggering on the road, so he was taken to the Prophet (s.a.w). When he was opposite al-Abbas's house, he escaped, and going in to al-Abbas, he grasped hold of him. When that was mentioned to the Prophet (s.a.w), he laughed and said: Did he do that? and he gave no command regarding him" (Abu Dawud).***

In another hadith: "Narrated Abu Salama: Abu Huraira said, ***"A man who drank wine was brought to the Prophet. The Prophet said, 'Beat him!'" Abu Huraira added, "So some of us beat him with our hands, and some with their shoes, and some with their garments (by twisting it) like a lash, and then when we finished, someone said to him, 'May Allah disgrace you!' On that the Prophet said, 'Do not say so, for you are helping Satan to overpower him'" (Bukhari).***

With regard to wine the companions have applied forty beatings, and they have also applied eighty beatings and it has come in a sound hadith that Ali said: ***"And all are Sunnah" (Muslim, Abu Dawud).*** The full hadith in Muslim read as follows: Hudain b. al-Mundhir Abu Sasan reported: ***"I saw that Walid was brought to Uthmin b.***

'Affan as he had prayed two rak'ahs of the dawn prayer, and then he said: I make an increase for you. And two men bore witness against him. One of them was Humran who said that he had drunk wine. The second one gave witness that he had seen him vomiting. Uthman said: He would not have vomited (wine) unless he had drunk it. He said: 'Ali, stand up and lash him. 'Ali said: Hasan, stand up and lash him. Thereupon Hasan said: Let him suffer the heat (of Caliphate) who has enjoyed its coolness. ('Ali felt annoyed at this remark) and he said: 'Abdullah b. Ja'far, stand up and flog him, and he began to flog him and 'Ali counted the stripes until these were forty. He (Hadrat 'Ali) said: Stop now, and then said: Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) gave forty stripes, and Abu Bakr also gave forty stripes, and Umar gave eighty stripes, and all these fall under the category of the Sunnah, but this one (forty stripes) is dearer to me" (Muslim).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT UMAR HAS LITTLE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAWS

The Rafidi stated: “And he has little knowledge of the laws: he commanded that a pregnant woman shall be executed (stoned to death) but Ali said to him: ‘If you have right upon her, you do not have right over what is in her womb.’ He suspended executing the punishment and said: ‘If not because of Ali, Umar would have destroyed.’”

We reply: If this story is true, it only means that Umar did not know that she is pregnant and Ali informed him about it. Undoubtedly, the basis is his lack of knowledge about her status and if the leader does not know that the one that deserved execution is pregnant and one of his subjects informed him about her condition; then this is part of informing him (the leader) of unknown condition of people and is part of what witnesses are required to inform. Therefore, this is something that is required by all leaders; whether they are prophets or leaders (or even judges etc.); this is not part of the major Islamic law.

It could also be said that: Umar forgot that a pregnant woman cannot be executed and when Ali told him he remembered and that is why he suspended the execution. If his opinion is that a pregnant woman can be executed he would have done so without considering anybody’s opinion. It come in a sound Sunnah of the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning al-Ghamidiyyah who said to him: ***“I am pregnant from adultery.” He said to her: ‘Go until you deliver the child’ (Muslim, Abu Dawud).***

If it happens that this knowledge is hidden to him until he was informed, he cannot be blamed or criticized for that. This is because Umar administered Muslims and none Muslims under the protection of the Islamic state! He delivered rights, execute legal punishments and judged between people and during his time Islam spread and is given victory to an extent that has not been attained before that time. He always give verdicts, legal opinions and judgments; if not due to his vast knowledge, he cannot be able to handle all that. Therefore, if

one case out of hundreds of thousands cases is hidden to him and then he acquired its knowledge or he has forgotten it and then he was caused to remember it; what is blameworthy about that? A lot of Sunnah of the Prophet (s.a.w) are unknown to Ali and some it he did not know up to the time he died.

SEGMENT: ON THE SHIA RAFIDI'S CLAIM THAT UMAR IS IGNORANT

The Rafidi stated: "He gave directives that a mad woman shall be executed. Ali said to him: The mad is not punished for what he has done until he regains his senses. He stopped the punishment and said: 'If not because of Ali, Umar would have been destroyed.'"

We reply that: This addition is unknown in the hadith. If he commanded that a mad woman shall be executed, it might be that he is not aware of her madness and being uninformed about her madness does not mean that he is ignorant of the law or he forgot about that and he was made to remember. Or he will think that the punishment is for avoiding harm in this world; and a mad person can be punished in order to prevent him from harming other people whether they have sense or they are mad. He might opined that adultery is an aggression against the community and thus, he can be punished for that, until he was informed that this is of the laws of Allah that can only be applied on those obligated to observe precepts of religion.

The Islamic law prescribed punishing children for abandoning prayer as The Apostle of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***"Command your children to pray when they become seven years old, and beat them for it (prayer) when they become ten years old; and arrange their beds (to sleep) separately"*** (Abu Dawud, Ahmad). Therefore, if a mad man is so aggressive and that his aggression (against people) cannot be stopped except by killing him; then it is allowed to kill him. Nay, even if an animal became so aggressive that its aggression cannot be stopped except by killing it, it will be killed and if it belongs to somebody, the one who killed it will not be required to pay its owner, in accordance to the verdict of the generality of scholars among who are Imam Malik, Shafi'i, and Ahmad etc.

Summarily, what are being criticized against Umar and other leaders falls within two issues: Either defect in knowledge or defect in religion and we are now explaining both issues. What the Rafidi mentioned about not giving Fatima Fadak, that he is displaying

nepotism in distribution of state wealth and that he is obstructing justice etc.! Means that he has not been just and fair, nay – according Shia – he is unjust: it is well known by all people that the justice of Umar filled all parts of the earth to the extent that people coined the maxim: “Conducts of the two Umars.” One of them is Umar bin khattab and the other is said to be Umar bin Abdulaziz – according to Ahmad bin Hanbal and scholars of hadith etc., - and it is said, it is Abubakar and Umar – according to Abu Ubaidah and a group of linguists and grammarians

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR FOR RECONSIDERING HIS OPINION ON DOWRY

The Rafidi stated: “He said in a sermon he delivered: ‘Whoever charged very high dowry, I will place it in the state treasury.’ A woman said to him: ‘How can you prevent us from enjoying what Allah has given us in His Book: **‘But if you intend to replace a wife by another and you have given one of them a Cantar (of gold i.e. a great amount) as Mahr, take not the least bit of it back; would you take it wrongfully without a right and (with) a manifest sin?’ (4:20).** He said: ‘Everybody is more learned than Umar, even veiled women’”

We reply that: This story is a great proof of the virtues of Umar, his religion, his fear of Allah, his returning to the truth (he is not arrogant) and his acceptance of the truth even from a woman; it showed that he is humble and that he accepts the grace of someone upon him even on small issue. It is not the best conduct for a man of higher status to refuse to pay attention to any issue (that is raised by the low people among his subjects). Hoopoe said to Prophet Solomon (a.s): **“But the hoopoe stayed not long, he (came up and) said: “I have grasped (the knowledge of a thing) which you have not grasped and I have come to you from Saba’ (Sheba) with true news” (27:22).** And Prophet Moses (a.s) said to Khidr: **“Musa (Moses) said to him (Khidr) ‘May I follow you so that you teach me something of that knowledge (guidance and true path) which you have been taught (by Allah)?’” (18:66).** The difference between Moses (a.s) and Khidr is greater than the difference that is between Umar and his colleagues among the Prophet’s companions. This issue did not make Khidr close to Moses (a.s); so there is no question of his being like him! Nay, Prophets that come after Moses (a.s) such as Joshua, David, and Solomon etc., are better than Khidr.

The Prophet’s companions (r.a) are the most knowledgeable, the most religious and the people who understood religion of Islam more than any other person in the Islamic community. Imam Shafi’i has

done well when he said: "They are above us in knowledge, jurisprudence, religion and guidance and their opinion for us is better than our opinion for ourselves." Ahmad bin Hanbal said: "The principle of Sunnah to us is to hold tightly to the practice upon which the Prophet's companions have been." Abdullah bin Mas'ud said: "O People! Whoever want to follow the footsteps of someone he shall follow the footsteps of those who are dead, because the living may fall into tribulation (Fitnah); those are the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w), they were by Allah the best of this nation, they possess the most sound and innocent hearts, the most deepest knowledge, the most moderate, they are not fabricators neither pretenders. They are people who have been chosen by Allah to accompany His Messenger and establishing His religion. Therefore, know their virtues and follow them in their footsteps and hold firmly to whatever you can be able to of their conducts and religious practices, for they are on the right guidance" (Musnad Imam Ahmad). Huzaifa said: "O you reciters! Be on the straight path and follow the path of your predecessors; if you remain on the straight path, they have preceded you and if you go left or right, you have strayed far away."

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI SLANDERED UMAR: HE HAS NO KWONLEDGE OF LEGAL PUNSHMENT ON WINE

The Rafidi stated: “He did not apply the legal punishment on Qudamah when he drank wine, because he recited to him: **‘Those who believe and do righteous good deeds, there is no sin on them for what they ate, if they fear Allah (by keeping away from His forbidden things), and believe and do righteous good deeds, and again fear Allah and believe, and once again fear Allah and do good deeds with Ihsan (perfection). And Allah loves the good doers’ (5:93).** Ali said Qudamah is not encompassed by this verse. He does not know with what to punish him. Ali said: ‘Punish him with eighty beatings, for if a person drink wine he become intoxicated, when he is intoxicated he will become delirious, and when he became delirious he will tell lies.’”

We reply that: This is a very clear lie against Umar for his knowledge with regard to this type of issue is so clear as to require evidence; he has applied the legal punishments for wine many times, so also Abubakar before him. They used to apply forty beatings sometimes and sometimes they apply eighty beatings and Umar sometimes chastise wine drinker by shaving his head or by sending him into exile and they used to apply the beatings sometimes with palm leaf stalk, sometimes with shoes or with hands or with tips of clothes.

With regard to the story of Qudamah: It has been narrated by Ishaq al-Jurjani and other scholars from Ibn Abbas, that Qudamah bin Maz’un drank wine and Umar asked him: ‘Why did you do that?’ He replied: **‘Those who believe and do righteous good deeds, there is no sin on them for what they ate, if they fear Allah (by keeping away from His forbidden things), and believe and do righteous good deeds, and again fear Allah and believe, and once again fear Allah and do good deeds with Ihsan (perfection). And Allah loves the good doers’ (5:93).** And I am among the first and the foremost Muhajirun and I have witnessed both Badr and Uhud.’ Umar said to those present: ‘Give reply to this

man!' They remained silent, He said to Ibn Abbas: 'give him reply.' Ibn Abbas said: 'This verse was revealed as an excuse for those who drank it in the past, before it is forbidden. Allah has revealed: **'O you who believe! Intoxicants (all kinds of alcoholic drinks), gambling, AlAnsab, and AlAzlam (arrows for seeking luck or decision) are an abomination of Shaitan's (Satan) handiwork. So avoid (strictly all) that (abomination) in order that you may be successful' (5:90).** This is the plea against people.' Umar thereafter asked those present its legal punishment and Ali bin Abi Talib said: "If he drank, he becomes delirious, and when he became delirious, he will tell lies, therefore give him eighty lashes."

In the above hadith, it is stated that Ali advised him to give him eighty lashes and this is doubtful. Surely what is confirmed in sound hadith is that Ali gave forty lashes before Uthman bin Affan, when he applied the punishment on Walid bin 'Uqbah and ascribed eighty to Umar. It also come in a sound hadith that Abdurrahman bin 'Auf advised the application of eighty lashes and thus punishing with eighty lashes is not among the things that Umar benefited from Ali and it has been narrated that Ali applied eighty lashes during his Caliphate; which showed that he used to apply eighty lashes sometimes and sometimes forty lashes. It was narrated that Ali said: "I never feel concerned while applying the law upon anybody and he died except the one who drink wine, for if he dies I will pay his blood money, because the prophet (s.a.w) did not determine a definite law for us (on wine drinker).

This has not been stated by any of the Prophet's companions and the jurists with regard to forty lashes or less than that and it is not allowed to employ the words of Ali on what has contradicted the consensus (of Muslim scholars).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR FOR A WOMAN WHO MISCARRIED OUT OF FEAR

The Rafidi stated: “He sent for a pregnant woman and she miscarried her pregnancy due to fear. The companions said to him: ‘You are only taking disciplinary action, thus there is nothing on you.’ He asked Ali, who obligated payment of blood money upon his clan.”

We reply thus: This is an issue of Ijtihad upon which scholars have differed. Umar used to consult the Prophet’s companions whenever something occurred; he used to consult Uthman, Ali Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf, Ibn Mas’ud, Zaid bin Thabit etc., to the extent that he used to consult Ibn Abbas; and this is part of his perfect intellect, religion and virtues and that is why he is among those whose views are sounder and more correct. He used to refer at times to the opinion of this one and at another time to the opinion of that person.

A woman was brought to him who confessed committing adultery and they agreed upon executing her and Uthman was silent. Umar said to him: “What is wrong with you, that you said nothing?” He replied: ‘I see that she takes adultery to be permitted; so she does not know that it is forbidden.’ Thus, Umar reviewed the case and he stopped execution of the law upon her due to what Uthman informed him. What Uthman means is that she is broadcasting and speaking about it freely, the way any person broadcast and speak about what is permissible, such as eating drinking, marrying and taking slave girls.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ASCRIBED STORY OF THE TWO WOMEN FASLY TO UMAR

The Rafidi stated: “Two women differed on a child each claiming its ownership. He (Umar) does not know the judgment, so he run to Ali and Ali invited the two women and preached to them, but none of them change her claim. He said: ‘Bring to me a saw.’ The women said: ‘What are you going to do with it?’ He replied: ‘I will divide the child into two so that each of you can take a half.’ One woman accepted the verdict, but the other said: ‘I beseech you, by Allah! O father of Hassan! If that must be done, let her take him.’ Ali said: ‘Allah is the Greatest! He is her son and not the child of that one; if he is her son she will have mercy upon him.’ The other woman confessed that the truth is with her companion. Umar became happy and supplicated for Ali.”

We reply: He (the Rafidi) did not mention the chain of authority of this story; nobody know who stated it, and I did not know any scholar who mentioned it; if it has any reality they would have mentioned it.

This story is never known concerning Umar and Ali, but it is well known concerning Prophet Solomon (a.s), the son of Prophet David (a.s).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED STORY OF THE WOMAN TO BE EXECUTED

The Rafidi stated: “He commanded that a woman who has a suckling child of six months to be executed. Ali said to him: ‘If I argue with you with the book of Allah, I will defeat you. Allah said: **‘...and the bearing of him, and the weaning of him is thirty (30) months...’ (46:15).** And He said: **‘The mothers shall give suck to their children for two whole years, (that is) for those (parents) who desire to complete the term of suckling...’ (2:233).**”

We reply: Umar used to consult the Prophet’s companions; sometimes he consults Uthman in what he sees right, sometimes he consults Ali or Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf or other persons among the companions. Allah has praised the believers on this conduct, when He said: **“And those who answer the Call of their Lord [i.e. to believe that He is the only One Lord (Allah), and to worship none but Him Alone], and perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and who (conduct) their affairs by mutual consultation, and who spend of what We have bestowed on them” (42:38).**

Scholars have differed concerning a woman who became pregnant and she does not have a husband or a master (in case of slave girl), and she did not claim any ambiguity: Shall she be executed? The opinion of Malik, scholars of Madina and some predecessors is that she shall be executed; this is also one of the opinions of Ahmad. The opinion of Abu Hanifa and Shafi’i is that she cannot be executed; this is also one of the opinions of Ahmad. They said, this is because she might have been forced to commit sex, or she committed it with some ambiguity or she became pregnant without sex.

The first opinion is the sound statement of the rightly guided Caliphs. It has been recorded in both Bukhari and Muslim that Umar said in the last phase of his Caliphate saying: **“Stoning is in the Book of Allah for those who commit adultery, men or women when they are muhsan (married) and when there is clear proof of pregnancy or a confession” (Bukhari, Muslim, Malik).** Thus, he

added pregnancy as a proof of illegal sexual intercourse, like witnesses.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED UMAR ON SHARING STATE WEALTH

The Rafidi stated: "He used to apply preferential treatment in sharing state wealth and war booty, while Allah has obligated equal sharing."

We reply that: With regard to war booty: Umar never share it by himself. It is the army that acquired it that distributed it between themselves after removing one fifth of it. The one fifth will be sent to him as they used to send it to other leaders before him and then he will distribute it to those who deserved it.

Umar and other leaders did not say that preference is obligatory upon war booty. Scholars have also differed on that question: can the leader give preference to some of those who acquired the booty over others? Summarily this is an issue hinged upon Ijtihad and if Umar justified preference due to some benefits; then he a person who Allah placed the truth upon his tongue and heart.

Concerning preference in sharing state wealth: there is no doubt that he does give preference in this issue; he divided people on it in degrees. It was reported that he said: "If I live to next year, I will place people upon one degree."

The person who said: "Allah has obligated equal sharing," did not mention an evidence to support his claim. If he has mentioned a proof, we will have discussed it as we have been discussing issues of Ijtihad.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DISPARAGED UMAR FOR EMPLOYING OPINION

The Rafidi stated: "He spoke with opinion, views and speculation."

We reply: using opinion to arrive at a legal verdict is not exclusive conduct of Umar. Nay, Ali used to employ his opinion more than all of them: Abubakar, Uthman, Zaid, Ibn Mas'ud and other Prophet's companions used to employ their opinions and the opinion of Ali with regard to fighting Muslims is one of the greatest issues. It comes in Sunan Abu Dawud etc., from Hasan, from Qais bin 'Ubbad, who said: ***"I asked Ali: Tell me about this your travel! Are you commanded by the Prophet (s.a.w) to do it, or it is an opinion you have arrived at?" He replied: 'The prophet (s.a.w) didn't command me anything about it, but it is an opinion that I arrived at.'"***^[129] This is a confirmed issue and that is why Ali did not report any hadith concerning the battles of the camel and Siffin, in like manner that he narrated hadiths concerning fighting the Kharijites.

Nobody that has little sense and fairness can doubt the conduct of Umar, his justice and his virtues. Nobody can disparage Abubakar and Umar except one of two men: Either a hypocrite, an atheist and an enemy of Islam who through disparaging them he is aiming at disparaging the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and the religion of Islam. This is the condition (and aim) of the first teacher of Shia Rafida; the first person to create Rafida creed, and it is the condition (and aim) of the Batinites. Or an ignorant person, who has gone to the extreme in ignorance and vain desires; and this is the situation of the generality of Shia masses, if they are Muslims in their hearts.

If a Rafidi says: Ali is infallible, thus, he cannot be talking with his opinion; nay, whatever he says is like the hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w). It will be said to him: Your companions in innovation; the Kharijites are all ascribing Ali to apostasy, although they are more truthful, more knowledgeable and more religious than Rafidah. Nobody who knew the state of these people and those people will doubt this fact.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DISPARAGED UMAR ON THE ISSUE OF CONSULTATION TO CHOSE THE NEXT CALIPH

The Rafidi stated: “He (Umar) made the issue (of the Caliphate) consultation after him. He thus differed with the one who has preceded him for he did not left the issue for people to choose whoever they like and he did not appoint somebody to succeed him. (He said that) he felt sorry that Salim the client of Abi Huzaifa has died, for if he is alive he will not have any doubt about appointing him; this although Ali is present.”^[130]

He joined among those to be chosen the superior and the inferior and it is well known that the superior has the right to be put forward over the inferior. He then criticized all those he has chosen for the consultation. (He said that) he lead Muslims while he is alive and he detests being responsible for their conduct while he is dead. He made the leadership among six and then he contradicted himself and made it among four people, then among three people and then on one person. He gave Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf the responsibility of choosing the next leader after he has described him with weakness and shortcomings. Then he said if Ali and Uthman agreed on an opinion, their opinion shall be accepted and if they are three, then the opinion of the group in which Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf belong shall be accepted, because he knew that Ali and Uthman will not agree on one opinion and Abdurrahman will not fail to choose his brother Uthman, and he is his paternal uncle. He thereafter commanded that they shall be killed if they delayed choosing the leader for over three days, although – according to them – they are among the ten that have been promised Paradise. He commanded that whoever differed with four of them shall be killed and he commanded that whoever differed with the three among whom is Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf shall be killed. All these directives contradicted religion.

Ali said: If I am appointed as leader – and they will not appoint me – I will surely carry them on the truth and the straight path. This showed that they will not appoint him to be the leader. He said to Uthman: If

you are appointed you will raise over people the family of Abu Mu'it and if you do that, you will surely be killed. This indicated that he commanded his slaying."

We reply to the above long submission thus: The above statement can be categorized into two: Either lying in what has been quoted and narrated or a critique of the truth, for in it there is what is clear lies or issues which its realities is unknown and what is identified as a truth, and which has nothing in it that call for disparaging Umar; nay they are counted among his good works and virtues, with which Allah terminated his work in this world. Alas! Those people, due to there extreme ignorance and vain desires, they turned upside down both the narrated and the rational facts. They come to issues that have taken place and everybody knew that they have taken place, but they will say: They have never taken place. And they mention thing that never occur, and everybody knew that they never occurred, but they will say: They have occurred. They come to things that are good and beneficial and say: Those things are corrupt and evil. And they will come to things that are corruption and evil, but they will say: Those things are good and beneficial! Therefore, they neither possess intellect, nor do they have sound traditions (hadiths), nay they have a great portion of the words of Allah: **"And they will say: 'Had we but listened or used our intelligence, we would not have been among the dwellers of the blazing Fire!'" (97:10).**

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: "He (Umar) made the issue (of the Caliphate) consultation after him. He thus differed with the one who has preceded him..."

We reply that: There are two types of differing: contradictory difference and diversified difference. The first type is that this person made something permissible and this person made it forbidden. The second type is like the methods of reciting the Qur'an, for reciting with any of them is permitted, although this person may chose a recitation method and that person may choose another method. This has come in sound tradition, nay they have been explained in details by the prophet (s.a.w). One of the traditions stated: ***Narrated 'Umar bin Al-Khattab: I heard Hisham bin Hakim reciting Surat Al-***

Furqan during the lifetime of Allah's Apostle and I listened to his recitation and noticed that he recited in several different ways which Allah's Apostle had not taught me. I was about to jump over him during his prayer, but I controlled my temper, and when he had completed his prayer, I put his upper garment around his neck and seized him by it and said, "Who taught you this Sura which I heard you reciting?" He replied, "Allah's Apostle taught it to me." I said, "You have told a lie, for Allah's Apostle has taught it to me in a different way from yours." So I dragged him to Allah's Apostle and said (to Allah's Apostle), "I heard this person reciting Surat Al-Furqan in a way which you haven't taught me!" On that Allah's Apostle said, "Release him, (O 'Umar!) Recite, O Hisham!" Then he recited in the same way as I heard him reciting. Then Allah's Apostle said, "It was revealed in this way," and added, "Recite, O 'Umar!" I recited it as he had taught me. Allah's Apostle then said, "It was revealed in this way. This Qur'an has been revealed to be recited in seven different ways, so recite of it whichever (way) is easier for you (or read as much of it as may be easy for you" (Bukhari).

Ibn Batta narrated from al-Zunj bin Khalid, from Isma'il bin Umayyah that the prophet (s.a.w) said to Abubakar and Umar: ***"If you had both agreed on a matter, I would not have opposed you"*** (Tabarani, Ahmad). The predecessors have agreed upon their precedence – even the (first) Shia of Ali. Ibn Batta narrated from his teacher Abil Abbas bin Masruq, that Abdullah bin Ishaq bin Judair said: Abu Ishaq al-Subai'i, went to Kufa and Shamar bin Atiyyah said to us: "Stand up and let us go to him." We went and sat before him and they spoke. Abu Ishaq said: "I left Kufa and nobody doubts the virtues of Abubakar and Umar and their precedence (over all other companions) and now I come back and heard them saying a lot of things; nay, by Allah, I do not know what they are saying."

From Nisaburi, from Abu Usam al-Halabi, from his father, from Dhamirah, from Sa'id bin Hasan who said, I heard Laith bin Abi Sulaim saying: "I met the first and foremost Shia and they do not give preference to anyone over Abubakar and Umar." Ahmad bin

Hanbal said: From Ibn 'Uyainah, from Khalid bin Salmah, from Sha'abi, from Masruq who said: "Loving Abubakar and Umar and knowing their virtues is part of the Sunnah." Masruq is one of the best Tabi'un of Kufa. Tawus said: "Loving Abubakar and Umar and knowing their virtues are among the Sunnah." A similar hadith has been narrated from Abdullah bin Mas'ud.

Why shall the first and the foremost Shia not give preference to Abubakar and Umar, while they heard Ali saying from the pulpit: ***"The best of this community after its Messenger (s.a.w) are Abubakar and Umar" (Bukhari, Abu Dawud).*** This hadith has been narrated on the authority of Ali from many chains of authorities; it is said that it reached over eighty (different chains of narrators). Bukhari has recorded in his sound book of hadith a hadith of Hamdaniyyun, who are very close companions of Ali, to the extent that Ali used to say concerning them: "If I am the gate keeper of the door of Paradise, I will say to Hamdani enter with peace." Bukhari recorded the hadith from Sufyan ath-Thauri, who is a Hamdani, from Munzir, who is also a Hamdani, ***from Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah who said: I said to my father (Ali bin Abi Talib): O my father! Who is the best person after the Prophet (s.a.w)? He replied: O my son! Don't you know that? I replied: No! He replied: Abubakar. I asked: Then who? He replied: Umar" (Bukhari).*** In another sound tradition, narrated Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiya: ***I asked my father ('Ali bin Abi Talib), "Who are the best people after Allah's Apostle?" He said, "Abu Bakr." I asked, "Who then?" He said, "Then 'Umar. " I was afraid he would say "Uthman, so I said, "Then you?" He said, "I am only an ordinary person" (Bukhari).*** These are statements he made between himself and his son, and thus it is not among the things upon which dissimulation can be claimed. He personally narrated this from his father and his father has declared it from the pulpit (in Kufa). Imam Ali also used to say: ***"Whoever is brought to me, giving preference to me over Abubakar and Umar, I will apply the legal punishment of a slanderer upon him. In the books of Sunan, the***

prophet (s.a.w) said: “Follow the footsteps of those two people after me; Abubakar and Umar” (Tirmidhi, Ibn Majah, Ahmad).

Umar is a leader and it rest upon him to appoint the best to lead the Muslims and he exercised Ijtihad on that and he saw that those six men deserved it more than anyone else and what he arrived at is the truth for nobody has said that other than them more deserved it. He gave them the responsibility of appointing the next leader from among themselves for fear of making mistake of not appointing the best among them. This is because the superiority of those six people is very clear to him in contrast to preponderance of one of them (over the others) and he said: The responsibility of appointing a leader is upon the six of them and they are to select one of them. This is the best Ijtihad of a just Imam, devoid of any vain desires.

And again, Allah the Most High said: **“And those who answer the Call of their Lord [i.e. to believe that He is the only One Lord (Allah), and to worship none but Him Alone], and perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and who (conduct) their affairs by mutual consultation, and who spend of what We have bestowed on them” (42:38).** And Allah said: **“... and consult them in the affairs. Then when you have taken a decision, put your trust in Allah, certainly, Allah loves those who put their trust (in Him)” (3:159).** Thus, what he did of commanding consultation is beneficial, promoting goodness and welfare. And what Abubakar has done of appointing Umar is also beneficial, promoting goodness and welfare; the perfection of Umar, his virtues and his being deserved to be appointed the leader are very clear to Abubakar and therefore consultation might not be necessary in such a situation; the effect of this blessed opinion on Muslims (and Islam) are very clear. Surely, every rational, fair minded person knows that any of Uthman or Ali or Talha or Zubair or Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf or Sa’ad cannot stand the stead of Umar and therefore, appointing Umar as deserved is like their appointment of Abubakar and giving him their vow of allegiance.

Abdullah bin Mas’ud said: “The best of those who made true predictions are three; daughter of the man in Madyan when she said:

‘And said one of them (the two women): O my father! Hire him! Verily, the best of men for you to hire is the strong, the trustworthy’ (28:26). The wife of Pharaoh when she said: **‘... A comfort of the eye for me and for you. Kill him not, perhaps he may be of benefit to us, or we may adopt him as a son.’ And they perceive not (the result of that)’ (28:9),** and Abubakar when he appointed Umar to succeed him.”

With regard to Umar: He saw that the six of them are close to each other and although some of them have some virtues which others do not have, the person who is inferior in those traits have other virtues in which he excel over others. He saw that if he appointed one of them only and some problem occurred during his Caliphate, it will be ascribed to him and therefore, he abandoned appointing one specific person out of fear of Allah and because he knew that none of them more deserved to be the leader over others. Therefore, he combined two benefits: Between appointing all of them because none of them deserved it over the others and avoiding appointing one of them due to what he feared of shortcomings. Undoubtedly, the six men are among those who the prophet died while he is pleased with them – and they are the men that Umar appointed – there is nobody who is better than them and although each of them has some traits that he detested, but detestable traits in other people are greater. And that is why after Uthman nobody became the Caliph who is better than him and nobody is better in conduct than him. Nobody became the Caliph after Ali who is better than him and nobody from among the Kings that ruled Muslims is better in conduct than Mu’awiyah and people have mentioned his conducts and virtues (in books of hadith and history etc.).

If each of those people have committed some sins; then know that other than them have committed greater sins and they have far less good works (in their accounts than them). These are among the things that shall be known necessarily. The ignorant person is like a fly that always descend on (foul smelling) wound and he will not descend on sound (body). This is in contrast to the intellectual who weigh things; this thing with that thing.

The Shia Rafidah are among the most ignorant people; they find fault against those they are attacking while they are praising those who have committed greater faults and when the scale of justice is placed it will be clear that those they are attacking more deserved to be preferred over those they are praising.

With regard what they mentioned concerning Salim the client of Abu Hudhaifa; it is well known that Umar and the other companions knew that the Caliphate is in Quraish, as has been abundantly explained in the books of Sunan. Narrated Ibn 'Umar: Allah's Apostle said, ***“This matter (caliphate) will remain with the Quraish even if only two of them were still existing” (Bukhari).*** It was also narrated on the authority of 'Abdullah that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: ***“The Caliphate will remain among the Quraish even if only two persons are left (on the earth)” (Muslim).***

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: “He joined the superior and the inferior and it is well known that the superior shall be advanced over the inferior.”

We reply that: Firstly: Those people are close in virtues and that one of them being superior to the other has not been detected the way the superiority of Abubakar and Umar are detected over the rest of them. This is why Umar while consulting sometimes take the opinion of Uthman, sometimes that of Ali and sometimes that of Abdurrahman bin 'Auf and each one of them have specific virtues which the one do not have.

Secondly: If there is among them a superior and an inferior; why did you say Ali is the superior and Uthman and the others are the inferiors? This statement (of the Rafidi) has contradicted the consensus of the Muhajirun and Ansar, as mentioned by many scholars, among them is Ayub as-Sakhtiyani who said: “Whoever preferred Ali over Uthman has scorned at the Muhajirun and Ansar.” It comes in sound hadith that Abdullah bin Umar said: ***“We used to grade people during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) – according to their merits and we used to give Abubakar precedence, then next to him Umar, and next to him Uthman” (Bukhari).*** In another version he said: ***“And then we stopped grading the prophet’s***

companions, without preferring any one above the other” (Bukhari). This is information about the conduct of the prophet’s companions during his life time concerning preferring Abubakar, then Umar, then Uthman. It was narrated that their grading used to reach the Prophet (s.a.w) and he did not objected to it. In this case, this grading have been textually established with what is a very clear opinion of the Muhajirun and Ansar during the time of the prophet (s.a.w), without anybody objecting to it and with what has been clearly shown after the death of Umar, for all of them gave the vow of allegiance to Uthman without any (material) inducement or fear (of his oppression), and none of them objected to his leadership.

Imam Ahmad said: “They never agreed upon giving allegiance to anyone, the way they agreed upon Uthman.” He was asked concerning successorship to Prophethood? He replied: “All of the vows allegiances given at Madina.” It is as he has mentioned for Muslims are more honored and well established at the end of the Caliphate of Umar, more that before that time.

All of them gave the vow of allegiance to Uthman, without any inducement or fear; surely, he never give anything to anybody for appointing him as the Caliph; neither money nor position of authority and even Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf that gave him the vow of allegiance was never given any money, nor was he appointed to any position of authority. Abdurrahman bin ‘Auf is one of the farthest people from needs (monetary or appointments), and although he has consulted all people; Bani Umayyah has no any influence (on him)and none among them is part of the consultative assembly other than Uthman. The Prophet’s companions are as described by Allah, the Most High: **“... Humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is AllSufficient for His creatures' needs, AllKnower” (5:54).** They have given vow of allegiance to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to tell the truth wherever they are and never fear the blame of the blamer. Yet none of them objected to the successorship of Uthman, nay among those who

gave him the vow of allegiance are ‘Ammar bin Yasir, Suhaib, Abu Dhar, Khabab, Miqdad bin Aswad and Ibn Mas’ud. Abdullah bin Mas’ud said: “We appointed the best of us at the top and we did not commit injustice.” Among them are Abbas bin Abdulmutallib, ‘Ubaidullah bin Samit, Abu Ayub al-Ansari etc.: thus if those people are not aware that Uthman more deserved the Caliphate than any other person, they would not have appointed him. This is an issue which whenever the experienced person ponder over it, he will increase in experience and knowledge and nobody doubt it except those who do not ponder over it among the scholars of polemics or the one who is ignorant of the reality or the methodology of investigation and advancing proofs.

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: “He then criticized all of those he has chosen for the consultation and showed that he never wants to be responsible for the affairs of the Muslims after his death as he is responsible for it while he is alive. He then made the leadership between the six.”

We reply that: Umar did not criticize them in a way that it will appear that other people more deserved the Caliphate than them. He did not hate appointing the six of them for he knew that nobody more deserved to be the Caliph from outside of them. Therefore, he is sure that Allah will recompense him for what he has done and he will not be blamed for being responsible for any shortcoming by choosing the six of them. What he fears to be blamed for any shortcoming is appointing a particular person among them and thus he abandoned doing that. These are due to the perfection of his intellect and religion. His detesting bearing its consequences while he is dead as he shouldered its responsibilities while he is alive is not because he hated leading Muslims while he is alive, for he surely led them by his choice and his leadership over the Muslims is better for him and for the Muslim community, although he is fearing judgment of the Hereafter.

The Rafidi stated: “He contradicted himself and made it among six people, then among three people, then on one person. He gave

Abdurrahman bin 'Auf the responsibility of choosing the next leader after he has described him of weakness and shortcomings."

We reply thus: In the first place it is necessary for whoever is proving an issue with a hadith to prove its soundness. This is because if a person says: The soundness of this narration is unknown; the plea has not been proven against him. The sound hadith on this issue as it appeared in Bukhari and other books of hadith are not similar to this (what the Rafidi has mentioned), nay it contradicted it and that it is the six men who reduced the contestants to three and the three appointed Abdurrahman to appoint one of them. Thus, Umar has nothing to do with that issue. The sound hadith on the authority of 'Amr bin Maimun partly read as follows: ***"...The people said (to 'Umar) - after he was stabbed - , "O chief of the believers! Appoint a successor." Umar said, "I do not find anyone more suitable for the job than the following persons or group whom Allah's Apostle had been pleased with before he died." Then 'Umar mentioned 'Ali, 'Uthman, Zubair, Talha, Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas and 'Abdur-Rahman (bin Auf) and said, "Abdullah bin 'Umar will be a witness to you, but he will have no share in the rule. His being a witness will compensate him for not sharing the right of ruling. If Sa'ad becomes the ruler, it will be alright: otherwise, whoever becomes the ruler should seek his help, as I have not dismissed (as governor of Kufa) him because of disability or dishonesty." 'Umar added, "I recommend that my successor takes care of the early emigrants; to know their rights and protect their honor and sacred things. I also recommend that he be kind to the Ansar who had lived in Medina before the emigrants and belief had entered their hearts before them. I recommend that the (ruler) should accept the good of the righteous among them and excuse their wrongdoers, and I recommend that he should do good to all the people of the towns (Ansar), as they are the protectors of Islam and the source of wealth and the source of annoyance to the enemy. I also recommend that nothing be taken from them except from their surplus with their consent. I also recommend***

that he do good to the 'Arab Bedouins, as they are the origin of the 'Arabs and the material of Islam. He should take from what is inferior, amongst their properties and distribute that to the poor amongst them. I also recommend him concerning Allah's and His Apostle's protectees (i.e. Dhimmis) to fulfill their contracts and to fight for them and not to overburden them with what is beyond their ability... When he was buried, the group (recommended by 'Umar) held a meeting. Then 'Abdur-Rahman said, " Reduce the candidates for rulership to three of you." Az-Zubair said, "I give up my right to Ali." Talha said, "I give up my right to 'Uthman," Sad, "I give up my right to 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Auf." 'Abdur-Rahman then said (to 'Uthman and 'Ali), "Now which of you is willing to give up his right of candidacy to that he may choose the better of the (remaining) two, bearing in mind that Allah and Islam will be his witnesses." So both the sheiks (i.e. 'Uthman and 'Ali) kept silent. 'Abdur-Rahman said, "Will you both leave this matter to me, and I take Allah as my Witness that I will not choose but the better of you?" They said, "Yes." So 'Abdur-Rahman took the hand of one of them (i.e. 'Ali) and said, "You are related to Allah's Apostle and one of the earliest Muslims as you know well. So I ask you by Allah to promise that if I select you as a ruler you will do justice, and if I select 'Uthman as a ruler you will listen to him and obey him." Then he took the other (i.e. 'Uthman) aside and said the same to him. When 'Abdur-Rahman secured (their agreement to) this covenant, he said, "O 'Uthman! Raise your hand." So he (i.e. 'Abdur-Rahman) gave him (i.e. 'Uthman) the solemn pledge, and then 'Ali gave him the pledge of allegiance and then all the (Medina) people gave him the pledge of allegiance" (Bukhari).

The Rafidi stated: "Then he said if Ali and Uthman agreed on an opinion, their opinion shall be accepted, and if they are three, then the opinion of the group which Abdurrahman bin 'Auf belongs shall be accepted. He did this because he knew that Ali and Uthman will not agree on one opinion and Abdurrahman will not fail to choose his brother, Uthman for he is his cousin."

We reply that: Who said that Umar has made such a statement? If he has said that, then it is not permitted for one to think that his goal is to appoint Uthman due to some personal attachment and love and in order to prevent Ali due to enmity against him. If that is his aim, he could have appointed Uthman right from the beginning and nothing undesirable will take place. How can anything bad happen while those who live after him have chosen Uthman without being appointed by him? Therefore, if Umar has appointed him, they would have been the greatest people to follow him and obey him. It is all the same whether it is as the believers say: They have been men of religion, goodness and justice or as the hypocrites, those who disparage them are saying: Their aims are evil and injustice. It is well known that Umar did not fear anybody while he is alive and Shia Rafidah are calling him the Pharaoh of the Islamic community. So if during his life time he does not fear proposing and forwarding Abubakar for the Caliphate; right at the beginning of this affair and at that time their hearts are not used to obeying anybody other the Prophet (s.a.w) and the affairs are not in his hand! Then how can such a person fear forwarding Uthman to be the Caliph after his death while all the people are obedient to him and they are used to being obedient to him? It is well known that if his aim is to forward Uthman he wouldn't have proposed such a long process in order to do it. And again, what interest do Umar have for Uthman to the exclusion of Ali? There is not between him and Uthman any relationship more than what is between him and Ali; neither a tribal attachment nor any other relationship.

The person who stated that: "He knew that Ali and Uthman will not agree on one opinion," has lied against Umar (Ali and Uthman – see the above hadith where the two of them agreed that Abdurrahman bin 'Auf shall appoint one of them). And absolutely there isn't any disagreement between Ali and Uthman during the life time of Umar, nay they are closer to each other than to the other four (in the consultative assembly); both of them are from Bani Abdu Munaf and they (those clans) are still relating and cooperating with each other.

The Rafidi stated: "Surely Umar knew that Abdurrahman will not fail to appoint his brother and his cousin."

We reply that: This is a clear lie against Umar and it is also a clear lie against Uthman and Adurrahman and their kindred relation; surely Abdurrahman is neither a brother nor a cousin to Uthman and absolutely he is not from the same tribe with him. Nay, that one is from Bani Zahrah and this one is from Bani Umayyah and Bani Zahrah are closer to Bani Hashim than their closeness to Bani Umayyah. Banu Zahrah are uncles of the Prophet (s.a.w) and Abdurrahman bin 'Auf and Sa'ad bin abi Qaqqas are from them. It is concerning Sa'ad that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"This is my cousin, so let a man show to me his cousin" (Tirmidhi)***. There is also no any (bond) brotherhood between Abdurrahman and Uthman, for the Prophet (s.a.w) did not establish bond of brotherhood between a Muhajir and a Muhajir. He also did not establish it between an Ansari and an Ansari; it was established between Muhajirun and Ansar, so he established brotherhood between Abdurrahman bin 'Auf and Sa'ad bin Rabi'ah al-Ansari, whose hadith are sound and well known in the books of hadith. Men of knowledge knew that as a fact and the prophet (s.a.w) never establish bond of brotherhood between Abdurrahman and Uthman.

The Rafidi stated: "he commanded that they shall be killed if they delayed appointing a leader after three days."

We reply that: Firstly: Who said that this (statement) is sound? Where is the sound hadith? The fact is that he commanded the Ansar not to leave them until they selected one among themselves.

Secondly: This is a lie against Umar and nobody has mentioned this among the scholars of hadith with any known, reliable chain of authority and Umar never commanded the murder of the six men, who he knew are the best of the Islamic community. How can he command their execution while if they are killed the situation will be worst and more corrupt? If he has commanded that they shall be killed he would have also directed that: After killing them you can appoint so and so. How can he command the killing of those who deserved the affair and he will not appoint anybody after them? This

is nothing but fabrication of liars who do not know what to write neither by law nor by custom and tradition.

It is surprising that the Shia Rafida are claiming that those who Umar commanded to be killed – if we assume the soundness of this narration – all deserved to be executed except Ali; then why are they objecting that directive and thereafter they are saying: He want to appoint them as leaders and he gave directive that they shall be killed? This is nothing but joining two opposite things.

If they say: He aimed at killing Ali! It will be said to them: If all of them gave their vows of allegiance except Ali, that action will not harm the Caliphate of the appointed Caliph;^[131] it is only the person that is feared (to stir dissention and rebellion) that is killed. Sa'ad bin Ubadah refused to give vow of allegiance to Abubakar and they neither beat him nor did they imprison him; then what more of killing him! And again, those who are saying that: Ali and Bani Hashim delayed giving allegiance to Abubakar for six months are also saying that; none of them have been beaten and nobody is forced to give the vow of allegiance! So if they did not force anybody to give vow of allegiance to Abubakar, – which to him has been established – how can they command killing people over giving vow of allegiance to Uthman, – which is not yet established? Abubakar and Umar throughout their periods have been extremely honoring Ali and the rest of the Bani Hashim and giving them precedence over all people. Abubakar used to say: ***“O you people! Give Muhammad (s.a.w) his right by taking care of his family.”*** Abubakar used to go to the house of Ali alone and with him are Bani Hashim. He will mention to them their virtues and they will also mention to him his virtues and confess to him that he deserved to succeed the Prophet (s.a.w); they sought his pardon for delaying giving their vows of allegiance and at that time he is alone among them. There are concurrent hadiths that showed the love, brotherhood, and understanding that is between them which necessitated falsifying and rejecting whatever contradicted that.

If Abubakar and Umar want to harm Ali during their Caliphate, in one way or the other, they could be able to do so. Those lying fabricators,

slanderers are saying that they committed injustice against him at a time when he is able to defend himself and stop them from committing aggression against him and at that time they are too weak as to commit injustice against him. Then why did they not commit injustice against him after they have become powerful and command obedience from people, if they really want to harm him?

The Rafidi stated: "He commanded that whoever differed from the four shall be killed and he directed that whoever differed from the three among who is Abdurrahman bin 'Auf shall be killed."

We reply that: This is a lie of the fabricators. If it assumed that he made such a statement, then know that Umar did not contradict any religious precept, it has been narrated on the authority of 'Arfaja who said: I have heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) say: ***"Different evils will make their appearance in the near future. Anyone who tries to disrupt the affairs of this Umma while they are united you should strike him with the sword whoever he be. (If remonstrance does not prevail with him and he does not desist from his disruptive activities, he is to be killed)" (Muslim).*** It has been narrated (through a still different chain of transmitters) on the Same authority (i. e. 'Arfaja) who said similarly-but adding: ***"Kill all of them."*** I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) say: ***"When you are holding to one single man as your leader, you should kill who seeks to undermine your solidarity or disrupt your unity" (Muslim, Abu Dawud).*** (See also footnote number 30) It has also been narrated on the authority of Aba Sa'id al-Khudri that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***"When oath of allegiance has been taken for two caliphs, kill the one for whom the oath was taken later" (Muslim).*** And the sound statement that has been obtained from Umar is that whoever wants to impose a leader without consulting the rest of the Muslims shall be killed due to these hadith. Umar (r.a) said: ***"(O people!) I have been informed that a speaker amongst you says, 'By Allah, if 'Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such-and-such person.' One should not deceive oneself by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abubakar was given suddenly and it was***

successful. No doubt, it was like that, but Allah saved (the people) from its evil, and there is none among you who has the qualities of Abubakar. Remember that whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consulting the other Muslims, neither that person, nor the person to whom the pledge of allegiance was given, are to be supported, lest they both should be killed” (Bukhari). With regard to the person who refused to give vow of allegiance and there is not any (armed) dissention or rebellion from his part; Umar never directed that such a person shall be killed, and it is not permissible to kill such type of person. What he mentioned about indications with regard to killing Uthman and indications with regard to abandoning appointing Ali are all clear lies against Umar, for his words are: ***“If you do that people will surely kill you”*** is an information on what people may do and not a command that they shall do that. And his words: ***“They will not appoint him to it,”*** is an information on what might happen and not a command that they shall not appoint him. We stated this although Umar has, not reliably stated the phrases in this context. Nay, it is a lie against him. Allah knows best.

SEGMENT: STATEMENTS ON THE RAFIDI'S DISPARAGEMENTS AGAIST UTHMAN

The Rafidi stated: "With regard to Uthman; he appointed over the affairs of Muslims those who are not suitable to be leaders, to the extent that some of them committed sins, some of them committed breach of trust and he distributed appointments among his relatives. He was criticized over that many times but he refused to stop. He employed Walid bin Uqbah and it appeared that he is drinking wine and he led prayer while he is intoxicated. He appointed Sa'ad bin Abi Sarh over Egypt until his subjects complained against his injustice. He wrote to him secretly to continue leading them in contrast to what he wrote to him publicly. He commanded that Muhammad bin Abubakar shall be killed. He appointed Mu'awiyah over Syria and he caused a lot of dissensions and tribulations. He appointed Abdullah bin 'Amr over Basrah and he committed many detestable things. He appointed Marwan over his affairs, gave him unrestrained powers, and hand over to him his seal; his behaviors led to his murder and the occurrence of tribulations in the Islamic community. He used to give his family a lot of money from the state treasury to the extent that he gave to four men from the Quraish – who he married his daughter – Four Hundred Thousand Dinar and he gave Marwan One Million Dinar.

Ibn Mas'ud used to criticize him and condemn him as apostate, so he gave verdict against him and he was beaten to death. He beat 'Ammar, he slit his body and the Prophet (s.a.w) has said concerning him: 'Ammar is beloved to me, he will be killed by an aggressive party that will not get my intercession in the Hereafter." 'Ammar used to criticize him. The Prophet (s.a.w) exiled Hakam bin Abi 'As, an uncle to Uthman, from Madina together with his son Marwan; he and his son continued to be in exile during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and throughout the periods of Abubakar and Umar, but when Uthman became the Caliph he gave them pardon and brought him back to Madina. He appointed Marwan as his secretary and personal assistant, although Allah the Most High has said: **"You will not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, making**

friendship with those who oppose Allah and His Messenger, even though they were their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred (people)..." (58:22).

He exiled Abu Dhar to Rabzah and he beat him very severely, although the Prophet (s.a.w) has said with regard to him: 'The earth has not taken and the sky has not given shade to anybody who is more truthful than Abu Dhar.' He said again: 'Allah has revealed to me that He loves four people among my companions and He commanded me to love them.' He was asked: 'Who are they, O Messenger of Allah? He replied: Ali, Salman, Miqdad and Abu Dhar.' He abandoned the law of Allah for he did not kill Ubaidullah bin Umar when he killed Hurmuzan the client of Ali after he became a Muslim. Ali was looking for Ubaidullah so that he can apply the legal sanction against him, but he fled to Mu'awiyah in Syria who gave him asylum. He wanted to relieve Walid bin Uqbah, but Ali applied the punishment on him saying: 'The law of Allah cannot be abandoned while I am present.' He innovated the second call to prayer on Friday; it is an innovation but they have converted it to Sunnah. He contradicted all of the Muslims until he was killed. They criticized his conduct and said to him: 'You are absent at the battle of Badr, you run away from the battle field at Uhud and you did not attend the vow of allegiance of Ridwan under the tree; narrations on that are too many and uncountable.'

We reply to all the above accusations as follows: It will be said: Those who have been appointed by Ali to govern some regions betrayed him and disobeyed him more than the betrayals and disobedience of the appointees of Uthman.^[132] People have written books on those who have been appointed by Ali and thereafter they took away money from the state treasury and betrayed him, among them there are those who deserted him and shifted to the side of Mu'awiyah. Ali has appointed Ziyad bin Abi Sufyan, the father of Ubaidullah who killed Husain, he also appointed Ashtar al-Nakh'i and Muhammad bin Abubakar and people that are similar to them. Anybody who has sense and is rational will not doubt that Mu'awiyah is better than all those people.

It is surprising that Shia Rafida are objecting to Uthman his conduct with regard to appointments, while Ali has done what is worse than that. They are saying that Uthman has appointed his relatives from Bani Umayyah, and it is well known that Ali has appointed his relatives from the side of his father and mother (to positions of authority), such as Abdullah and Ubaidullah the children of Abbas. He appointed Ubaidullah bin Abbas over Yemen, he appointed Quthum bin Abbas over Ta'if and Makka, he appointed Sahal bin Hunaif over Madina, some people said it is Thumamah bin Abbas, he appointed Abdullah bin Abbas over Basrah, and he appointed over Egypt his adopted son, who grew under his roof, Muhammad bin Abubakar (Ali married the widow of Abubakar and Muhammad grew up in his house).

And again, Shia Imamiyyah are saying that Ali has made will appointing his progeny (one after the other to succeed him as Caliphs). And it is well known that if appointing relatives is objectionable and detestable, then appointing them to the Supreme Leadership (Caliphate) is greater than appointments to discharge some duties, and appointing ones children is more objectionable and detestable than children of the uncle. That is why a representative or guardian that is prevented from buying something for himself, is also prevented from buying it for his son, in accordance to one of the opinions of scholars of jurisprudence. The person who is given money to give to whoever he likes (as charity), cannot convert it into his own property and he cannot give it to his son; in accordance to opinion of the scholars of jurisprudence. They also differed on the Caliphate: Can an incumbent Caliph makes will for his son to succeed him? There are two opinions on that. His testifying and bearing witness for his son is also rejected by most of the scholars while giving witness by the children of his uncle is not rejected. There are many similar laws with regard to this issue. These are because the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“You and your wealth belonged to your father” (Ibn Majah)***. And he said: ***“Whoever gives a gift cannot return it, except the father, who can retrieve what he gave to his son” (Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi)***. This is based on the

hadith reported on the authority of Ibn `Abbas and Ibn `Umar that the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) said: ***“It is not lawful for a man to give gift and afterwards to take it back except a father regarding what he gives his child. The parable of one who gives a gift and then takes it back is like the parable of a dog which eats till when it is satisfied, it vomits and then takes his vomiting back”*** (Abu Dawud, Nasa’i, Ibn Majah, and Tirmidhi).

If they claimed that Ali has appointed his progeny based on the commands of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). We reply that: Firstly: We believe that Ali is a rightly guided Caliph, likewise Uthman, and before we knew the reason why each one of them did what he has done; surely some thought and doubts that will be directed against what Ali has done are greater than those directed against what Uthman has done.

If somebody says: Ali has plea and proofs for what he has done. It will be replied that: The plea and proofs of Uthman on what he has done are greater. And if infallibility is claimed for Ali’s actions in order to make the criticizer to keep quiet! Then what is claimed for Uthman of exercising Ijtihad in order to make the criticizer keep quite is more rational and closer to the directives of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w).

It is the conduct of Shia Rafida to mention some people, who clearly by apparent sense perception and sound texts, it is arrived that they are more perfect in conduct than the other and then they will make the superior among them as the blameworthy, who deserved disparagement and they will make the inferior as an infallible that deserved praises. This is like the conduct of the Christians who will come to the Prophets (a.s), whom Allah has preferred some of them above the others and they will turn the inferior among them into a god and turn the superior one defective and lesser than the companions of Jesus and this is nothing but turning the truth upside down. The greatest surprising thing about all these is that they turned the companions of Jesus, - who are not Prophets – to infallible men and they disparage some Prophets such as Solomon

(a.s) and others. It is well known that Abraham (a.s) and Muhammad (s.a.w) are better than Jesus by many proofs and evidences. Nay, Prophet Moses (a.s) also is better than him. Then how can Christians make the companions of Jesus (a.s) better than Abraham (a.s) and Muhammad (s.a.w)? This is nothing but ignorance and extremism which Allah has forbidden them. Allah said: **“O people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians)! Do not exceed the limits in your religion, nor say of Allah aught but the truth. The Messiah 'Iesa (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary), was (no more than) a Messenger of Allah and His Word, ("Be!" - and he was) which He bestowed on Maryam (Mary) and a spirit (Ruh) created by Him...” (4:171).**

Shia Rafida are also described with extremism in the Islam community because among them there are those who are claiming that Ali is god and those people are worse than the Christians. Among them there are those who are claiming that he is a prophet and whoever say that there is another prophet after Muhammad (s.a.w); is just like following Musailamah the liar and those similar to him who have claimed prophethood. Ali is free and absolved from such claims in contrast to those who claimed prophethood like Musailamah and others.

The Shia Imamiyyah are claiming that leadership is proved by Divine appointment and Ali and many among his progeny are infallible and that the Prophet's companions committed injustice against him and took away his rights. Claiming infallibility is similar to association in Prophethood, for undoubtedly it is obligatory to obey and follow the infallible in whatever he say and it is prohibited to contradict him in anything. Now, this is an exclusive characteristic of Prophets and that is why we are commanded to believe in what has been revealed to them. Allah the Most High said: **“Say (O Muslims), "We believe in Allah and that which has been sent down to us and that which has been sent down to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and to Al-Asbat [the twelve sons of Jacob], and that which has been given to Moses and Jesus, and that which has been given to the Prophets from their Lord. We make no distinction**

between any of them, and to Him we have submitted (in Islam)” (2:136). Thus, belief in what the Prophets have brought is among the things we commanded to believe in and to utter it, and this is among the things upon which all Muslims agreed upon; that it is obligatory to believe in each of the Prophets of Allah and whoever disbelieves in one of them is an unbeliever and it is obligatory to execute whoever abuses him by the consensus of scholars. This is not the case with regard to those who are not prophets, whether they are called friends of Allah (Awliya) or leaders (Imams) or the wise men (Hukuma) or scholars (Ulama) or they are called with any other name. Whoever made someone infallible, who must be believed and obeyed in whatever he says after the Prophet (s.a.w) has given him the meaning and definition of a Prophet even though he did not give him the designation. It is said to this type of person: What is the difference between this and the Prophets of Bani Isra’il who are commanded to follow the laws of the Torah?

It is well known that those statements have contradicted the religion of Islam; the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w) and the consensus of the predecessors of this community and its scholars because Allah the Most High has said: **“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination” (4:59).** Thus, Allah did not command us to refer to anybody when we differ, except to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and whoever maintains that there is another infallible (other than the prophet), has made referring differences to him obligatory because whatever he says is the truth, just like the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); this has contradicted the Qur’an.

Furthermore, it is obligatory to obey the infallible and to give him an absolute, unrestricted obedience and whoever contradicted him deserved punishment (in the Hereafter) and the Qur’an affirms this only on the right of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Allah the Most

High said: **“And whoso obeys Allah and the Messenger (Muhammad), then they will be in the company of those on whom Allah has bestowed His Grace, of the Prophets, the Siddiqun (those followers of the Prophets who were first and foremost to believe in them, like Abu Bakr AsSiddiq radhiallahu'anhu), the martyrs, and the righteous. And how excellent these companions are!” (4:69).** And He said: **“(Mine is) but conveyance (of the truth) from Allah and His Messages (of Islamic Monotheism), and whosoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, then verily, for him is the Fire of Hell, he shall dwell therein forever” (72:23).** Therefore, the Qur'an has shown in many places, that whoever obeys the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is among the people of happiness and success (Paradise) and He did not lay as a condition for that obeying another infallible. Whoever contradict and disobey the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is among the people that deserved punishment (in the Hereafter), even if it happened to be the one he think is infallible.

The Messenger of Allah is the only one that distinguish between the people of Paradise and the people of Hell Fire; between the righteous, pious persons and the criminals, between the truth and falsehood, between misguidance and guidance, between the straight path and the crooked way and Allah made him the distinguisher by who He divided people into the damned and the happy; nobody has this status other than him. That is why men of knowledge – people of the Book and Sunnah – have agreed upon the fact that; with the exception of the Messenger of Allah; the statement of anybody can be accepted and it can be rejected. As for the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); it is obligatory to believe in whatever he say and to be obeyed in all what he commanded, for he is the infallible that does not speak out of his desire, whatever he says is nothing but revelation and people will be questioned concerning him in the day of judgment, as Allah the Most High has said: **“Then surely, We shall question those (people) to whom it (the Book) was sent and verily, We shall question the Messengers” (7:6).**

People will be questioned about their Prophet (s.a.w) in their graves and each one of them will be asked: Who is your Lord? Who is your Prophet? Narrated Anas: The Prophet said, ***“When a human being is laid in his grave and his companions return and he even hears their foot steps, two angels come to him and make him sit and ask him: What did you use to say about this man, Muhammad ? He will say: I testify that he is Allah's slave and His Apostle. Then it will be said to him, 'Look at your place in the Hell-Fire. Allah has given you a place in Paradise instead of it.' "The Prophet added, "The dead person will see both his places. But a non-believer or a hypocrite will say to the angels, 'I do not know, but I used to say what the people used to say! It will be said to him, 'Neither did you know nor did you take the guidance (by reciting the Quran).' Then he will be hit with an iron hammer between his two ears, and he will cry and that cry will be heard by whatever approaches him except human beings and jinns” (Bukhari).*** If it happens that he mentioned anybody other than the prophet (s.a.w), from among the companions, leaders (Imams), Tabi'un or scholars (or Sheikhs); that will not benefit him and man will not be questioned about anybody in his grave other than the Prophet (s.a.w).

What we aimed here is to explain that whatever plea is made in order to excuse Ali in what he is criticized; there are stronger pleas and excuses to defend Uthman. Undoubtedly, Ali has fought over the Caliphate and for that purpose many people were killed and during his Caliphate neither fighting the unbelievers, nor opening their countries for Islam through conquest took place and in that period, Muslims did not increase in goodness. He also appointed as governors and other positions of authority his close relatives; therefore, both of them have appointed their close relatives and the appointees of Uthman are more obedient and the farthest than committing evil than the appointees of Ali. With regard to the money which Uthman shared by Ijtihad; it is likened to the Ijtihad of Ali in fighting and shedding blood and the issue of shedding blood is more dangerous and greater than the issue of sharing money.

Secondly: You (Shia sects) have differed greatly on the issue of Divine appointment (of Ali and his progeny) you are claiming and this necessitated sure knowledge, that you do not possess anything reliable to prove your claims; nay each group among you fabricates whatever they like. Again, the generality of the Muslims are saying: We have sure knowledge – nay necessary certainty – that the claim to Divine appointment is a lie. This has been proven in details with many proofs in the right place.

Thirdly: If this is the case, the pleas and proofs of Uthman are very clear for he is saying: It is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) who appointed Bani Umayyah to positions of authority; he employed them during his life of time and after him Abubakar and Umar employed them and gave them appointments. We did not know any Quraish clan that has been given appointments by the Prophet (s.a.w) more than Bani Abdu Shams, because they are numerous and among them are honor and respect (by other Arab clans). After the conquest of Makka, the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed over the best town 'Attab bin Usaid bin Abil 'As bin Umayyah, he appointed over Najran Abu Sufyan bin Harb bin Umayyah. The Prophet (s.a.w) also appointed Khalid bin Sa'ad bin 'As over the collection of Zakat in Bani Muzahhaj and Sana'a in Yemen and he remained there up to the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). The Prophet (s.a.w) also appointed Sa'id bin 'As over Tima, Khaibar and the villages of 'Urainah, and he appointed Abban bin Sa'id bin 'As to lead some army detachment and after that he appointed him as the governor of Bahrain and he remained its governor after 'Ala bin Hadrami until the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). The Prophet (s.a.w) also appointed Walid bin 'Aqbah bin Abi Mu'it until Allah revealed concerning him: **“O you who believe! If a rebellious evil person comes to you with a news, verify it, lest you harm people in ignorance, and afterwards you become regretful to what you have done.” (49:6).** Therefore Uthman is saying: I did not employ but those who the Prophet (s.a.w) has employed from among them, their type and their clan and the same thing could be said about Abubakar and Umar after him. Abubakar has appointed Yazid bin Abi Sufyan bin

Harb over the conquest of Syria and Umar confirmed him and after him, Umar appointed his brother Mu'awiyah. What has been mentioned about their appointment by the Prophet (s.a.w) is sound and well known knowledge, nay it has been concurrently reported by scholars of hadith; the scholars knew it as a fact and none of them is denying it.

SEGMENT: CONTINUED RESPONSES TO THE RAFIDI'S DISPARAGEMENT OF UTHMAN

GENERAL PRINCIPLE: The general principle on this affair is that we do not believe that anybody is infallible after the Prophet (s.a.w). Nay, Caliphs and those who are not Caliphs can commit mistakes and they commit sins from which they may repent, they may be forgiven due to many righteous deeds, they may be tried with tribulations and tests by which Allah forgive them and Allah may forgive them due to other reasons (i.e. Mercy of the Most Merciful). The utmost of what is being narrated as accusations against Uthman can either be a sin or a mistake and he has acquired many means of forgiveness, such as his being among the first and the foremost Muslims, his strong belief, his struggle and efforts in the path of Allah and other forms of obedience to Allah. it come in many sound hadiths that the Prophet (s.a.w) has attested for him Paradise, gave him glad tidings that he is among the denizens of Paradise due to some tribulation and test that will befall him. He has also repented to Allah for all the things that they objected to him, he was tried with great tribulation by which Allah forgave him his omissions and commissions and he remained patient until he was killed unjustly as a martyred; this is one of the greatest things by which Allah forgive sins.

What the Kharijites are opposing and objecting against Ali cannot be more than a sin or a mistake. He has acquired means of forgiveness through many things among which are: His being among the first and foremost Muslims, his belief, his struggle and efforts in the path of Allah and other forms of obedience to Allah. The Prophet (s.a.w) has confirmed that he is among the people of Paradise. He has repented to Allah for many things that has been objected against him and in which he was criticized and regretted their occurrence. He was killed unjustly as a martyred. This general principle is enough for the intellectual to keep quiet concerning what the Prophet companions have been accused of committing and not to give verdict against them as something desirable or obligatory unnecessarily.

Therefore, what the Rafidi stated that: "Uthman has appointed as governors those who are not suitable for that appointment!" this claim can either be false for he appointed only those who are suitable to be appointed or he appointed those who are not suitable, but while doing so he is exercising Ijtihad, thinking that those he has appointed are suitable while in reality they are unsuitable. Thus, he has made a mistake and this is not a blameworthy action.

This is Walid bin Uqbah whose conduct was blamed by the Qur'an and whose story is well known in the books of exegesis of the Qur'an, hadith and history. The Prophet (s.a.w) appointed him over the collection of Zakat of some Arab tribes. When he went near their habitations, they come out to him in order to receive him and welcome him. He thought that they have come out in order to fight him. He sent message to the Prophet (s.a.w) informing him that they come out to fight him and he decided to send an army against them, at that moment Allah the Most High revealed: **"O you who believe! If a rebellious evil person comes to you with a news, verify it, lest you harm people in ignorance, and afterwards you become regretful to what you have done"** (49:6). If the condition of this man is hidden to the Prophet (s.a.w); why shall such condition not be hidden to Uthman? If it is contended that: Uthman gave him appointment after that. It will be replied that: The door of repentance is wide open. This is Abdullah bin Sa'ad bin Abi Sarh who become Muslim and was appointed as a scribe of revelation by the Prophet. He later reneged, killed some of the companions and joined the disbelievers. After the conquest of Makkah, when he heard that the Prophet had ordered his execution, he took refuge with his milk-brother Uthman. The latter gave him shelter, then took him to the Prophet with a request once again to accept his conversion to Islam. The Prophet remained silent. Then Uthman asked a second time, whereupon the Prophet accepted Abdullah ibn Sa'd's oath of allegiance. In a hadith it is narrated by Abdullah ibn Abbas who said: ***"Abdullah ibn Abu Sarh used to write (the revelation) for the Apostle of Allah (p). Satan made him slip, and he joined the polytheists. The Apostle of Allah (p) commanded to kill him on***

the day of Conquest (of Mecca). Uthman ibn Affan sought protection for him. The Apostle of Allah (p) gave him protection” (Sunan Abu Dawud Book 39, Number 4345).

Many of those who have been appointed by Ali were later on found by him to be below his expectations. Uthman and other leaders cannot be blamed for this type of conducts. The most extreme verdict that can be given on this is that Uthman appointed some people while there are others who are more suitable than them; but these are actions upon which Ijtihad is permissible. Someone may say: His love for his relatives made him to incline towards them to the extent that he thinks that they more deserved to be appointed than anybody else or that what he has done is a sin. We have explained that he will not be punished for that sin in the Hereafter.

The Rafidi stated: “It appeared among some of them (appointees of Uthman) profligacy and among some of them betrayal of trust.”

We replied that: When a conduct appeared after an appointment, it does not mean that that is the conduct appointee before he is appointed, it also does not mean that the one who appointed him knew that he has that (bad) conduct. When Uthman learnt that Walid bin Uqbah has drunk wine, he called him and applied the legal punishment upon him. Uthman also used to remove from position of authority whoever he comes to find out that he deserved removal and he punish whoever he find out that he deserved to be punished.

The Rafidi stated: “He used to distribute state money to his relatives.”

We reply that: The extreme limit that could be said about this claim is that it is a sin that will not be punished in the Hereafter. How can that be, if it is among areas where Ijtihad is permissible? Generally speaking, all those who became Caliphs after Umar used to give some special attention to their relatives; either by giving them some appointments or giving them some money. Ali has also appointed his relatives.

The Rafidi stated: “He appointed Walid ibn ‘Uqbah until it appeared that he is drinking wine and he led people in prayer while he is

intoxicated.”

We reply that: Undoubtedly, he invited him and applied upon him the Islamic law in the presence of Ali. He said to Ali: Stand up and flog him.” In a hadith, narrated Ali ibn Abu Talib: Hudayn ibn al-Mundhir ar-Ruqashi, who was Abu Sasan, said: ***I was present with Uthman ibn Affan when al-Walid ibn Uqbah was brought to him. Humran and another man bore witness against him (for drinking wine). One of them testified that he had seen him drinking wine, and the other testified that he had seen him vomiting it. Uthman said: He could not vomit it, unless he did not drink it. He said to Ali: Inflict the prescribed punishment on him. Ali said to al-Hasan: Inflict the prescribed punishment on him. Al-Hasan said: He who has enjoyed its pleasure should also bear its burden. So Ali said to Abdullah ibn Ja'far: Inflict the prescribed punishment on him. He took a whip and struck him with it while Ali was counting. When he reached (struck) forty (lashes), he said: It is sufficient. The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) gave forty lashes. I think he also said: "And Abubakar gave forty lashes, and Umar eighty. This is all Sunnah (standard practice). And this is dearer to me" (Abu DAud).*** Since he has executed the Islamic law, with the verdict of Ali, he has done what is necessary upon him as a leader.

The Rafidi stated: “He appointed Sa'id bin 'As over Kufa and he did things that made the people of the town to expel him from the city.”

We reply that: Just because the people of Kufa have expelled him, it does not mean that he has committed what necessitate such action. This is because the people of Kufa used to rebel against any governor that is appointed over them. They have also rebelled against Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas and he is the one who conquered those countries, broke the backbone of the Persian army (and Empire) and he is one of the members of the consultative assembly (to choose the next Caliph among themselves after Umar was stabbed); they never have a governor like him. They also complained against other governors such as 'Ammar bin Yasir, Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas, Mughirah bin Shu'abah etc., to the extent that Umar

prayed against them saying: "O Allah made things complicated for them as they have made things complicated for me." If it happens that the governor has committed a sin for which the people of Kufa expelled him; then what is the fault of Uthman? Does it mean he has accepted his sin? The appointees of Ali have committed many sins; nay more than one appointee of the Prophet (s.a.w) has committed sins. The supreme leader (the Caliph), only commits sin when he abandon executing the Islamic law, or refuses to bestow rights or commit aggression against others etc.; if it happens that some sins have been committed (by Uthman), that has been discussed and explained already.

The Rafidi stated: "He appointed Abdullah bin Sa'ad bin Abi Sarh over Egypt,^[133] and its people complained about his injustice and he wrote to him secretly to continue ruling them in contrast to what he wrote to him publicly."

We reply that: This is a lie against Uthman and he has sworn that he never writes anything like that and he is truthful servant of Allah even if he did not swear. The utmost thing that has been said is that Marwan wrote those letters without his knowledge and they requested that he hand over Marwan to them so that they can kill him, but he refused to surrender him to them. Thus, if killing Marwan is wrong by law, he has done what is necessary (in safeguarding blood of his subject); if killing him is allowed but it is not obligatory, he has done what is allowed and if killing him is obligatory, then it is an affair upon which Ijtihad is permissible; surely it has not been confirmed that Marwan has committed a sin that made his killing obligatory by law. This is because counterfeiting does not obligate execution. If it happens that Uthman has abandon an obligation; reply to this has already been given in the general principles (above). The Rafidi stated: "He commanded the killing of Muhammad bin Abubakar."

We reply that: This is another lie against Uthman. Whoever knew the condition and conduct of Uthman and is fair to him, knew that he is not the type of person that will command the killing of Muhammad bin Abubakar or those similar to him. Uthman has never killed

anybody of this type (without right); they planned to kill him and Muhammad is among those who went into his house, but he never commands anybody to kill them in self-defense. Then, how can such a person initiate killing a person whose blood is sacred?

If it is confirmed that Uthman has commanded the killing of Muhammad bin Abubakar, he cannot be censured for that. Nay, if he has commanded the killing of Muhammad bin Abubakar, he deserved to be obeyed more than those who demanded that Marwan shall be handed over to them, because Uthman is a leader of guidance and a right guided Caliph who is responsible of administering his subjects with justice and to deal with anybody whose evil cannot be stopped except by killing him. As for those who want to kill Marwan; they are rebels, out laws, who want to spread corruption upon the earth and who have not been mandated to kill anybody and they have not been instructed (by the leader) to execute a punishment. The utmost limit of their claim is that they have been wronged on some issue and it is not for each person who has been wronged to kill the person who has done wrong to him. Nay, he is not even allowed to execute the punishment upon him. Marwan is not an instigator of evil and tribulation more than Muhammad bin Abubakar and neither is he more religious and knowledgeable than him. Scholars of the books of sound books of hadiths have narrated a number of hadiths from Marwan, he also has some legal opinions, but scholars have differed on whether he is a companion or a Tabi'i.

The Rafidi stated: "He appointed Mu'awiyah over Syria and he caused a lot of tribulations."

We reply that: Mu'awiyah was appointed over Syria by Umar bin Khattab after the death of his brother Yazid bin Abi Sufyan and he continued to be the governor during the Caliphate of Uthman, who added more areas of jurisdiction to him. The conduct of Mu'awiyah with his subjects is one of the best and they love him. It has come in a sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"The best of your leaders are those whom you love and who love you, who pray for you and you pray for them. The worst of your leaders; are***

those whom you hate and they hate you, and you supplicate against them and they also supplicate against you” (Muslim, Ahmad, Tirmidh, Darimi).

Tribulation appeared from the side of Mu’awiyah after the murder of Uthman, and when he was killed tribulation became general in the Islamic community; it encompasses most of the people and thus it is not exclusive to Mu’awiyah. Nay, he sought for peace more than most of them and he is the farthest away from evil more than most of them. Mu’awiyah is better than Ashtar Nahk’i, Muhammad bin Abubakar, Ubaidullah bin Umar bin Khattab, Abi ‘Awar as-Salmi, Hashim bin Hashim al-Mirqal, ‘Ash’ath bin Qais al-Kandi, Yusuf bin Abi Artah and other people that have been with Ali.

The Rafidi stated: “He appointed Abdullah bin ‘Amir over Basrah and he committed objectionable things.”

We reply that: Abdullah bin ‘Amir has good works and he is loved by his subjects; and this is something that cannot be denied. Whatever the governor committed of sin is upon him and against him. Who said that Uthman is pleased with what he has done or has accepted what he has committed?

The Rafidi stated: “He appointed Marwan over his affairs, gave him unrestricted powers and handed over to him his seal. His behavior led to the murder of Uthman and the occurrence of tribulation in the Islamic community.”

We reply that: The murder of Uthman and the occurrence of tribulation are not triggered by Marwan alone. Nay, there are many factors that caused it; of those things are what have been objected against Marwan. Uthman at that time has reached a very advance age and they (his governors) used to do things without informing him and thus he is not the one who commanded what has been objected against him. He used to remove those he found wanting from their positions and sometimes he leave them. We have already explained this in the general principles.

When the rebellious, corrupt people come to Uthman with the intention of killing him, they have complained to him a number of

things, which he accepted and acted upon to the extent of removing those they want him to remove from their appointments and positions; that the keys of the state treasury shall be handed over to the person they accept and that he shall not give anybody anything from the state treasury without consulting the Prophet's companions and receiving their consent. They reached a point where they have no more any request or complain to make for all have been listen to and addressed. That is why Aisha (r.a) said: "You (people) squeezed him the manner in which clothes are squeezed and then you went to him and killed him." It was said that a letter was fabricated commanding that they (the rebels) shall be killed and they intercepted the letter on the road. Uthman denied writing that letter and he is telling the truth. They accused Marwan of writing the letter and requested that he be handed over to them, but he refused their request.

If we assume that this story is true; it does not make the murder of Uthman permissible. The utmost limit that could be said is that Marwan has committed a sin for his desire to see that they are killed, but his goal has not been achieved. Whoever attempted killing a person, but he did not kill him, it is not obligatory to kill him. So it is not obligatory to kill Marwan with the like of this issue. Yes! Caution shall be exercised against whoever commits such acts; he shall be held at bay and punished; but killing! No, that is a great affair.

The Rafidi stated: "He use to give to members of his family a lot of money from the state treasury, to the extent that he gave four men from Quraish – he married his daughters to them – Four Hundred Thousand Dinar and he gave Marwan One million Dinar."

We reply that: Firstly: Where is the sound hadith narrated on this issue? Yes he used to give his relatives a lot of gifts (from his personal wealth) and he also used to give those who are not his relatives. He used to do good to all Muslims, but accusing him of handing out this large sum of money requires sound narration (to prove it).

Secondly: This is a clear lie against Uthman and the rest of the rightly guided Caliphs never give to anybody large sum of money

close to this amount. It is well known that Mu'awiyah used to give money to those he court their intimacy more than what Uthman used to give to people; with all that the utmost limit he gave Hasan bin Ali is One Hundred Thousand or Three Hundred Thousand Dirham and they mentioned that he never give to anybody the like of that amount. Yes, Uthman used to give some of his relatives gifts and presents that have been objected against him by some people. We have already stated its interpretation and general explanation will be made on that issue.

Summarily, every leader needs some people he can rely on for his protection and they defend him from those who want to harm him, especially if the subjects did not rally around their leader in the like manner they rally round Abubakar and Umar; he need intimate retinue that he can rely on and they must be sustained with enough wealth; this is one of the explanations. The second explanation is that administering the money of Zakat in which Allah the Most High has said: **“As-Sadaqat (here it means Zakat) are only for the Fuqara' (poor), and Al-Masakin (the poor) and those employed to collect (the funds)...” (9:60)**. Thus, a person who is an administrator of charity can take from it even if he is rich and he can give some of it to his workers by the consensus of all Muslims.

The Rafidi stated: “Abdullah bin Mas'ud used to criticize him and call him an apostate.”

We reply that: Surely, this is a very clear lie against Abdullah bin Mas'ud. Surely the scholars of hadith knew that Ibn Mas'ud never ascribe Uthman to unbelief. Nay, when Uthman was appointed the Caliph, Ibn Mas'ud went to Kufa and said: “We have appointed the best of us to the top and we did not abstain.” The Prophet's companions never objected anything against Uthman in the first periods of his Caliphate, but during his last period they objected against him a number of things; in some of those things they are excused while in most of those things Uthman is excused. Among the problems with Ibn Mas'ud is that some grudges remained in his heart against Uthman because he appointed Zaid to compile the Qur'an in one book form, instead of him and he also asked the

companions to wash their own copies. The generality of the companions are with Uthman for appointing Zaid instead of him. Uthman is better than all those who censured him; he is better than Ibn Mas'ud, 'Ammar bin Yasir, Abu Dhar etec., from many angles and that has been confirmed by many proofs. Therefore, blames of the inferior against the superior are foremost to the contrast. Nay, if one is able to speak about them, then he shall speak with knowledge and fairness otherwise he shall speak only of what is known of their virtues and religion and that which they differed upon and what occurred between them is left to Allah to judge. This is why we are commanded to keep quite on what has occurred between them, because we will not be questioned concerning that. Umar bin Abdulaziz said: "Allah has cleaned my hands from those bloods and I will not want to stain my tongue with it." Allah the Most High said: **"That was a nation who has passed away. They shall receive the reward of what they earned and you of what you earn. And you will not be asked of what they used to do" (2:133).**

But if an innovator (or atheist) appears and he is disparaging them, then it is necessary to defend them and mention what will falsify their false accusations with knowledge, justice and fairness. The same thing can be mentioned about what has been narrated that 'Ammar spoke against Uthman saying: "Uthman has apostate clearly." Hasan bin Ali objected to his statement and Ali replied to him saying: "O 'Ammar! Do you disbelieve in the Lord that Uthman believe in? They are all lies and fabricated stories.

The Rafidi stated: "He gave verdict that Ibn Mas'ud shall be beaten, until he died."

We reply that: This is a lie by the consensus of all scholars, for when he was appointed as Caliph, he confirmed Ibn Mas'ud to continue administering Kufa until he reached a term appointed by Allah. Absolutely Ibn Mas'ud did not die by punishment applied upon him by Uthman.

Summarily, if it is said that Uthman has commanded the beating of Ibn Mas'ud or 'Ammar; such action do not infer censure on any among them; for we bear witness that the three of them have been

pardoned by Allah and that the three of them are friends of Allah. We have already mentioned that a friend of Allah can commit what will make him deserve legal punishment let alone rebuttals or warnings.

The Rafidi stated, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: “Ammar is a skin membrane between my eyes, he will be killed by an aggressive party and I will not intercede for them before Allah in the Hereafter.”

We reply that: ***What come in sound hadith is: “Ammar will be killed by an aggressive party” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** A group of scholars have weaken it among them is Husain al-Karabisi. With regard to the word: “Ammar is a skin membrane between my eyes,” it is an addition in the hadith which do not have any chain of authority, and it is fabricated, likewise the addition: “I will not intercede for them in the Hereafter.” Even if such a statement has been made; it has come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Fatima is part of me and whatever makes her doubtful also make me doubtful” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** And in another hadith he said: ***“If Fatima the daughter of Muhammad steals, I will cut her hand” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** It also comes in a sound hadith that he love Usama saying: ***“O Allah! I love him, so love him and love whoever loves him” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Notwithstanding this, when Usama killed a man he sternly objected to his conduct and said: ***“O Usama! You killed him after he had said, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah?'" I said, "O Allah's Apostle! He said so in order to save himself." The Prophet said, "You killed him after he had said, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah." The Prophet kept on repeating that statement till I wished I had not been a Muslim before that day” (Bukhari).*** Therefore, Uthman has priority of knowledge and justice upon all those he applied legal punishment upon them or those he rebuked. Thus, if it obligatory to defend Ali against those who are accusing him on similar issues! Then defending Uthman against those who are accusing him on similar issues is a prime obligation.

The Rafidi stated: “the Prophet (s.a.w) exiled Hakam bin Abu ‘As, the uncle of Uthman, from Madina, together with his son Marwan. They continued to be in exile during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and

throughout the periods of Abubakar and Umar. When Uthman became the Caliph, he gave him sanctuary and brought him back. He made Marwan his scribe, secretary, and chief planner; although Allah the Most High has said: **“You will not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, making friendship with those who oppose Allah and His Messenger, even though they were their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred (people). For such He has written Faith in their hearts, and strengthened them with Ruh (proofs, light and true guidance) from Himself. And We will admit them to Gardens (Paradise) under which rivers flow, to dwell therein (forever). Allah is pleased with them, and they with Him. They are the Party of Allah. Verily, it is the Party of Allah that will be the successful” (58:22).**

We rely that: Without any doubt Hakam bin Abu ‘As is among those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka, and they are about two thousand men. At that time his son Marwan is a small boy for he is an age mate of Abdullah bin Zubair and Musawwar bin Mukhrimah. His age at the time of the conquest of Makka is about seven years, a little more than that or less than that. Those who embraced Islam at the time of the conquest of Makka do not live in Madina during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w). Therefore, if it is true that he exiled him, then it shall be from Makka and not Madina and if he expel him from Madina he will send him to Makka. Many scholars have rejected the claim that he was exiled, saying that he went there by his own choice.

Uthman did not commit any sin by employing Marwan as his secretary, for he has not committed any blameworthy act and he is a child at that time; whose good works and bad works are not recorded for him or against him. At the time when the Prophet (s.a.w) dies, Marwan has not yet reached the age of adolescent by the consensus of scholars; the utmost limit is that he has reached ten years of age or something close to that and he is a Muslim both openly and inwardly, reciting the Qur’an and learning the religious laws and jurisprudence. Before the advent of tribulation, there is nothing

blameworthy in his conduct and therefore, Uthman has not sinned by appointing him as his scribe. When tribulation occurred, it affected those who are better than Marwan and he is not among those who are enemies of Allah and His messenger (s.a.w). Hakam his father is among those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Makka and most of those people perfected their religion; just because a person has committed some sins that do not transform him into a hypocrite.

The Rafidi stated: "He exiled Abu Dhar to Rabzah and gave him a painful scourge, although the Prophet (s.a.w) has said concerning him: 'The earth has not taken and the sky has not given shade to anybody more truthful than Abu Dhar.' And he said: 'Surely Allah has revealed to me that He love four of my companions.' He was asked: 'Who are they, O Messenger of Allah?' He replied: 'There master is Ali, Salman, Miqdad, and Abu Dhar.'"

We reply that: Undoubtedly Abu Dhar went to live in Rabzah^[134] by his free choice and he died there because of his differences with people; he was an abstemious, austere, and righteous man. He believe among other things that living an austere life is obligatory and that whatever a person retain above his needs (every day) is hoarding of wealth, with which the hoarder will be punished in Hell Fire. When Abdurrahman bin 'Auf died and left behind some property, Abu Dhar said that it is a hoarded wealth and thus, its owner deserved punishment in the Hereafter. Uthman used to debate him on his ideas and when Ka'ab entered and supported Uthman, he beat him. Similar case has happened between him and Mu'awiyah in Syria. All the rightly guided Caliphs, the Prophet's companions and the Tabi'in disagreed with the opinion of Abu Dhar. It come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **"No Zakat is due on property mounting to less than five Uqiyas (of silver), and no Zakat is due on less than five camels, and there is no Zakat on less than five Wasqs." (A Wasqs equals 60 Sa's) & (1 Sa=3 K gms App.)" (Bukhari).** Thus, the Prophet (s.a.w) denied the obligation of Zakat in what is less than Two Hundred Dirham and it is not based on whether it is a surplus over the needs of the owner of the money or not. Again, the Prophet's companions said that

hoarded up wealth are the money upon which Zakat is not removed and handed over to those who deserved them or deserve to administer them. Therefore, Abu Dhar want to obligate upon people what Allah has not made obligatory upon them and he is finding fault in them on what Allah has not blamed them; although he is exercising Ijtihad on that issue (he is wrong). He will be recompensed for his obedience to Allah, the way other Mujtahid's like himself will be recompensed. This is the reason why Abu Dhar secluded himself from people and not because Uthman has any evil intention against him. His being the most truthful does not entail that he is better than others. Nay, he is a weak believer as has been explained by sound hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w): ***“O Abu Dhar! I can see that you are weak and I love for you what I love for myself: Do not be a leader over two people and never administer the property of an orphan” (Muslim)***. It was narrated that Abu Dhar said: ***I said: O Messenger of Allah, will you not appoint me (to a position of authority)? He struck me on the shoulder with his hand and said: “O Abu Dhar, you are weak and it is a trust, and on the Day of Resurrection it will be a source of humiliation and regret, except for the one who takes it and fulfills all obligations and does all duties required” (Muslim)***. It comes in another sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“A strong believer is better and is more lovable to Allah than a weak believer, and there is good in everyone...” (Muslim)***.

Men of the consultative assembly (Uthman, Ali, Talha, Zubair, Abdurrahman bin 'Auf, Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas) are strong believers, while Abu Dhar and those similar to him are weak believers. Therefore, the believers who are suitable to be successors of the Prophet (s.a.w), such as Uthman, Ali, Talha, Zubair, Abdurrahman bin 'Auf, Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas are better than Abu Dhar and those similar to him. The hadith that has been mentioned by this Rafidi concerning Abu Dhar is weak. Nay, it is fabricated, and it does not have a sound chain of authority.

The Rafidi stated: "He abandoned the laws of Allah for he did not kill Ubaidullah bin Umar, when he killed Hurmuzan, the client of Ali bin Abi Talib after he become a Muslim. Ali was looking for Ubaidullah, so that he can apply the legal sanction against him, but he fled to Mu'awiyah in Syria. He wanted to relieve Walid bin 'Uqbah (from legal punishment), but Ali applied the punishment on him saying: 'The law of Allah cannot be abandoned while I am present.'"

We reply that: His statement that Hurmuzan was a client of Ali is a lie for Hurmuzan is from Persia. He is among those who was sent by their King to fight Muslims. He was captured by the Muslims in the battlefield and brought to Umar. He feigned embracing Islam and so Umar bestowed upon him favor and freed him. When Umar was killed by Abu Lua Lua the Magian, unbeliever, who is a slave of Mughirah bin Shu'ubah; Muslims made investigation and they found that Abu Lua Lua and Hurmazan are intimate friends, and they have been spotted planning the murder of Umar. Ubaidullah was informed accordingly that he is among those who have been accused of aiding the murder of his father. Abdullah bin Abbas spoke when Umar was stabbed and Umar said to him: **"No doubt, you and your father (Abbas) used to love to have more non-Arab infidels in Medina. 'Abbas had the greatest number of slaves.' Ibn 'Abbas said to 'Umar. 'If you wish, we will do.' He meant, 'If you wish we will kill them.' 'Umar said, 'You are mistaken (for you can't kill them) after they have spoken your language, prayed towards your Qibla, and performed Hajj like yours'" (Bukhari).** This is verdict of Ibn Abbas and he is more knowledgeable, more religious and better than Ubaidullah bin Umar, seeking permission from him to kill all Persians that are living in Madina. When he accused them of being infidels (who are feigning Islam), Ibn Abbas think that killing them is permissible. Therefore, how can Ubaidullah not believe that killing Hurmuzan is permissible? Or that anybody who participated in the murder of Umar deserved execution? If the murder of Umar, Uthman, Ali and people similar to them is considered as a form of fighting Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w); then whoever participated in it whether directly or indirectly is part of those who committed the

crime, in accordance to the verdict of most of the scholars. On the basis of this, whoever is associated with the murder of Umar – even by making statement – must be killed. And Hurmuzan is among those mentioned to have aided the murder of Umar. If that is the case then killing him is obligatory; but applying and executing the law is the responsibility of those in authority. Ubaidullah hasten in killing Hurmuzan and the leader can pardon the person who took the law into his hand (if it is right).

The Rafidi stated: “Surely Ali wanted to kill Ubaidullah bin Umar.”

We reply that: If this statement is sound it is a disparagement of Ali; but the Shia Rafida have no intellect; they want to praise a person with what is closer to censure. Then we say: I wish I know the time when Ali wanted to kill Ubaidullah? And when did Ali get the opportunity of killing him? Or when is he free so that he can look into his issue? Ubaidullah is supported by thousands of Muslims among who are Mu’awiyah. Ali was not able to remove Mu’awiyah from his position; then how can he able to kill ubaidullah?

It is surprising that the blood of Hurmuzan, who has been accused of hypocrisy; a person who is fighting Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and trying to fill the land with corruption and mischief is being defended tenaciously, while the blood of Uthman is made and considered a wastage and unimportant, although he is the leader of the Muslims, a proven denizen of Paradise, who – he and his brothers – are the best of the creation after the Prophets of Allah.

It is well known by concurrent reports that Uthman absolutely do not want the blood of the Muslims to be shed and that he was patient towards the people who debase his honor and those who want to kill him. They surrounded him (while he is inside his house) with the intention of killing him, he knew their intentions and Muslims have come from all direction aiding him, supporting him and asking him to allow them to fight them, but he is commanding people not to fight and asking whoever he has a right of obedience upon him not to fight them. It was narrated that he told his slaves: “Whoever among you did not fight in my defense, is free.” He was asked to go to Makka, but he replied: “I will not be among those who caused

bloodshed in the blessed sanctuary.” He was asked to go to Syria and he replied: “I will not leave the home of my immigration.” He was asked to fight them and he replied: “I will not be the first person to succeed Muhammad (s.a.w) in his community with the sword.” The patient exercised by Uthman until he was killed is one of his greatest virtues in the estimation of Muslims. Therefore, whoever criticized Uthman that he used to permit the shedding blood of Muslims by obstructing the laws and justice, shall know that Ali has been criticized with what is greater than that. It will be permissible for the person who hated Ali, display enmity against him and fight him to say: Ali has abandoned and obstructed the obligatory application of the lawful punishment upon the murderers of Uthman. He hindered the application of this legal punishment; if it obligatory, then it is a greater corruption than hindering the legal punishment that is obligated by killing Hurmuzan. If it is obligatory to defend Ali with the plea that he is excused because he is exercising Ijtihad or he is incapable of doing so (due to some difficult factors); then defending Uthman with the plea that he is excused by Ijtihad is the foremost conduct (and the right path).

The Rafidi stated: “Uthman wanted to abandon the legal punishment of drinking wine upon Walid bin Uqbah, but Ali applied the legal punishment.”

We reply that: This is a lie against both of them! Nay, Uthman directed Ali to apply the punishment upon him, it is narrated in a sound hadith as follows: ***Hudain b. al-Mundhir Abu Sasan reported: I saw that Walid was brought to Uthmin bin. 'Affan as he had prayed two units of prayers of the dawn prayer, and then he said: I make an increase for you. And two men bore witness against him. One of them was Humran who said that he had drunk wine. The second one gave witness that he had seen him vomiting. Uthman said: He would not have vomited (wine) unless he had drunk it. He said: 'Ali, stand up and lash him. 'Ali said: Hasan, stand up and lash him. Thereupon Hasan said: Let him suffer the heat (of Caliphate) who has enjoyed its coolness. ('Ali felt annoyed at this remark) and he said: 'Abdullah b.***

Ja'afar, stand up and flog him, and he began to flog him and 'Ali counted the stripes until these were forty. He ('Ali) said: Stop now, and then said: Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) gave forty stripes, and Abubakar also gave forty stripes, and Umar gave eighty stripes, and all these fall under the category of the Sunnah, but this one (forty stripes) is dearer to me" (Muslim). Thus, Ali lessens the punishment for him and gave forty lashes and if he has given him eighty lashes Uthman will not object to him.

The Rafidi stated: "Ali said: The law of Allah will not be abandoned while I am present."

We reply that: This is a lie and if it is true, then it is one of the greatest praise and virtues of Uthman. This is because he has accepted the request of Ali and he did not stop him from applying the legal punishment, although he can be able to stop him, for whenever Uthman want to do something he will do it and Ali cannot be able to stop him. If otherwise and Ali can be able to stop him doing what has been objected against him and he did not stop him, although to him it is objectionable; and he can be able to stop him; then this is a reproof and a censure against Ali. If Uthman obeyed Ali in what he asked him to do concerning application of the legal punishment that indicated his justice and his adherence to the religion of Islam and its precepts. Uthman appointed Walid bin Uqbah as governor over Kufa, and according to Shia making such an appointment is not permissible; if it is forbidden and Ali can be able to stop him; it become incumbent upon Ali to stop him and if he did not stop him, it either showed that – according to him – what Uthman has done is right or he is weak. And if he is unable to stop (Walid bin Uqbah) from being appointed as a governor; how can he be able to apply legal punishment on him? Thus, it is known that Ali cannot be able to apply legal punishment on Walid, if not because Uthman consented to its execution and if Uthman has consented to its execution; that showed his adherence to the religion of Islam and its precepts. Shia Rafida always make statements that nullify and contradict each other.

*** Furthermore, you (Shia Rafidah) are claiming that the laws of Allah and the legal punishments have been abandoned (during the Caliphate of the three Caliphs), while Ali is present and silent out of fear and dissimulation. You further claimed that, even during his (Ali) Caliphate, he abandoned Islamic laws and legal punishments out of fear and dissimulation. Thus, he abandoned telling the truth out of dissimulation. Therefore, if at all he made that statement before Uthman, he did so because he knew that Uthman and his aids will accept his words on carrying out the legal punishment; if he fears them, he will not make the statement.

The Rafidi stated: "He added the second call to prayer on Friday and it is an innovation, but now it has become a Sunnah."

We reply that: Without any doubt, Ali is one of those who agreed with him on that during the period of Uthman and after his death. That is why when he became the Caliph he did not command the stoppage of the second call to prayer in the like manner that he objected to a number of appointees of Uthman. Nay, he directed the removal of Mu'awiyah and other governors. It is well known that removing this "innovation" is lighter and easier than removing those governors and fighting them, an action that failed to produce the desired objective. Removing the so called innovation and other innovations from Kufa will have been easier for him and people would have abide by his directives and transmit them to others. If it is claimed that people will not accept its removal. We reply that: This is a proof that people have agreed with Uthman in seeing it as desirable and likening it – even those who fought in the side of Ali such as 'Ammar, Sahal bin Hanif etc., among the first and foremost Muslims. It is surprising that the Shia Rafida are objecting against Uthman what he has done in the presence of the Muhajirun and Ansar and they did not object against him. All Muslims have followed his footsteps on the second call to Friday prayer, while they themselves (Shia Rafidah), have added in the call to prayer some slogans and phrases that are not known during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and nobody has transmitted that he has commanded those additions. That is there statement: "Come and attend the best of acts."

We knew out of necessity that the call to prayer that Bilal and Ibn Umm Makhtum use to recite during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) at Madina and the one that is used by Abu Mahzurah in Makka and the one that is used by Sa'ad al-Qurz at Quba mosque does not contain the Rafidi slogan and if it has contained it Muslims would have transmitted it and they will never abandon it for they have transmitted what is sound (of the Sunnah of call to prayer). Since nobody among those who transmitted and narrated the methods of calling to prayer has transmitted this addition, it is arrived at the fact that it is a false innovation. [\[135\]](#)

The Rafidi stated: "All the Muslims opposed him, up to the time he was killed. They criticized his conduct and say to him: 'You are absent at the battle of Badr, you fled from the battlefield at Uhud and you did not attend the vow of allegiance of Ridwan (under the tree);' narrations on that issue are too many and uncountable."

We reply that: With regard to your statement: "All the Muslims opposed him, up to the time he was killed." If you mean by that they opposed him an opposition that permits his killing or that all of them have commanded that he shall be killed, or they are satisfied that he has been killed or they aided in killing him. Then these are things that are known by everybody to be clear lies, for surely nobody murdered him but a small group of unjust aggressors. Ibn Zubair said: "Those who killed Uthman are cursed, they went to him like thieves (coming in) from behind the city and Allah killed them a mighty slaughter and those who escaped among them does so under the cover of celestial bodies." He means that they run away in the night and most of the Muslims are absent. Those who are present among the people of Madina did not know that they wanted to kill him, until they have killed him. If the Rafidi means that all the Muslims have opposed him in all what he has done or in that which has been objected against him: Then this too is a lie, because nothing has been protested against him except that a lot of Muslims are with him and they accepted his conducts. Nay, the Muslims scholars who cannot be accused of sycophancy or flattery, who agreed with Uthman on what has been objected against him are

better in the estimation of Muslims than those who have agreed with what has been objected against Ali; either in all the issues or in most of them. Those who desired and moved to kill Uthman are wrong in their desires. Nay, they are unjust aggressors, who have overstepped the limits of Allah and His bounds. If it happens that there are among them some men who Allah has forgiven; even then this does not deny the fact that Uthman has been killed unjustly.

Those who said to Uthman: You are absent at the battle of Badr and allegiance of Ridwan and you fled at the day of Uhud are very few men among the Muslims and none of them has been mentioned specifically except two or three people and Uthman , Ibn Umar and other companions have give them replies to those questions. It comes in sound hadith as follows: ***Narrated 'Uthman bin Mauhab: A man came to perform the Hajj to (Allah's) House. Seeing some people sitting, he said, "Who are these sitting people?" Somebody said, "They are the people of Quraish." He said, "Who is the old man?" They said, "Ibn 'Umar." He went to him and said, "I want to ask you about something; will you tell me about it? I ask you with the respect due to the sanctity of this (Sacred) House, do you know that 'Uthman bin 'Affan fled on the day of Uhud?" Ibn 'Umar said, "Yes." He said, "Do you know that he (i.e. 'Uthman) was absent from the Badr (battle) and did not join it?" Ibn 'Umar said, "Yes." He said, "Do you know that he failed to be present at the Ridwan Pledge of allegiance (i.e. Pledge of allegiance at Hudaibiya) and did not witness it?" Ibn 'Umar replied, "Yes," He then said, "Allahu-Akbar! (Allah is the Greatest)" Ibn 'Umar said, "Come along; I will inform you and explain to you what you have asked. As for the flight (of 'Uthman) on the day of Uhud, I testify that Allah forgave him. As regards his absence from the Badr (battle), he was married to the daughter of Allah's Apostle and she was ill, so the Prophet said to him, 'You will have such reward as a man who has fought the Badr battle will get, and will also have the same share of the booty.' As for his absence from the Ridwan Pledge of allegiance if there had been anybody more respected by the***

people of Makka than 'Uthman bin 'Affan, the Prophet would surely have sent that man instead of 'Uthman. So the Prophet sent him (i.e. 'Uthman to Mecca) and the Ridwan Pledge of allegiance took place after 'Uthman had gone to Mecca. The Prophet raised his right hand saying. 'This is the hand of 'Uthman,' and clapped it over his other hand and said, "This is for 'Uthman.'" Ibn 'Umar then said (to the man), "Go now, after taking this information" (Bukhari). On the day of Hudaibiyah the prophet (s.a.w) gave vow of allegiance with his hand on behalf of Uthman and his hand is better than the hand of Uthman. In addition to that, the vow of allegiance on that day was taken because of Uthman. The Prophet (s.a.w) sent Uthman to Makka as his emissary and news reached him that the people of Makka have killed him. Thus, he took the vow of allegiance from his companions to fight the people of Makka (in order to seek for revenge for Uthman) on the condition that they will fight to death and they will not fled away and Uthman is a partner in that vow of allegiance. with regard to the issue of fleeing from the battle of Uhud, Allah the Most High has said: **"Those of you who turned back on the day the two hosts met (i.e. the battle of Uhud), it was Shaitan (Satan) who caused them to backslide (run away from the battlefield) because of some (sins) they had earned. But Allah, indeed, has forgiven them. Surely, Allah is OftForgiving, Most Forbearing"** (3:155).

Therefore, Allah has forgiven all those who run away from the battle field on the day of Uhud and with this even those who are below the status of Uthman have been forgiven. Then, what will prevent him from being among those forgiven, with his virtues and a lot of good works?

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI PRESENT THE OPINIONS OF SHAHRASTANI ON DISAGREEMENTS AFTER THE PROPHET

The Rafidi stated: “Shahrastani^[136] who is one of the greatest fanatics against Shia Imamiyyah has stated that; what stimulated corruption after the ambiguity of Satan is the conflict that occurred while the Prophet (s.a.w) was terminally ill and he said: ‘Come, let me write for you a statement after which you will not go astray. 'Umar said, ‘The Prophet is seriously ill and you have the Qur'an; so the Book of Allah is enough for us.’ The people present in the house differed and quarreled. Some said ‘Go near so that the Prophet may write for you a statement after which you will not go astray,’ while the others said as Umar said. When they caused a hue and cry before the Prophet, Allah's Apostle said, ‘Go away!’”

We reply that: What Shahrastani is transmitting; he and men similar to him who wrote books on sects and denominations are nothing but copying from each other and most of the copied materials are not ascribed to the source from which it is taken and most of it has not got any chain of authority. Nay, Shahrastani just quoted from the books of sects and denominations that have been written before him, like the book of Abu Isa al-Warraaq, who is among Shia Rafidah. He also quoted from the books of Shia Zaidiyyah and the books of Mu'atazilites who are disparaging most of the companions. Surely, a man of vain desires accepts what agrees with his vain desires without proof and he will reject what goes against his vain desires without any evidence that necessitate its rejection. There isn't among all groups a sect that rejects the truth and accepts falsehood like Shia Rafida, because the leaders of their sect and their true Imams that innovated it and lay its foundation are hypocrites and atheists and this fact has been mentioned by many scholars and it is very clear for the person who ponder over it.

If the issue is as stated we say: What we knew of the good works, outstanding traits, and virtues of the Prophet's companions through the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w) and sound

transmitted concurrent hadiths cannot necessarily be pushed away or ignored due to some statements that are either disjoined or altered or are not blameworthy in reality. This is because certainty cannot be removed by doubt and we are sure and certain on what has been stated by the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w) and the consensus of our righteous predecessors, in addition to what has testified and proved that of concurrently transmitted rational proofs; that the Prophet's companions are the best people after the Prophets. Therefore, these certain knowledge cannot be impaired by doubtful things! How about if we knew that those statements are false?

The Rafidi stated: "Shahrastani who is one of the greatest fanatics against Shia Imamiyyah..."

We reply that: This is not true, but he inclines to many things of its beliefs. Nay sometimes he mentions some beliefs of the Shia Isma'iliyyah, the Batinites and supports them and this is why some people accused him of belonging to the Isma'iliyyah sect (who are worse than Rafidah). If his affairs are not like that; those who accused him have advanced proofs of their claims with his statements and his conducts. It could also be said: In the one hand he is with Shia and in the other hand he is with Ash'ariyyah scholastic theologians.

What the Rafidi stated quoting from Shahrastani that: "What stimulated corruption after the ambiguity of Satan is the conflict that occurred while the Prophet (s.a.w) was terminally ill..."

We reply that: This is a very clear lie, for if he means that this is the first sin that has been committed; then this statement is clearly false. And if he means that this is the first conflict after that ambiguity; then it is also false from many angles:

Firstly: The ambiguity of Satan did not cause conflict or disagreement between the Angels, and human beings did not hear it from him, so that he can cause conflict and disagreement between them.

Secondly: There are conflicts since the time of Prophet Noah (a.s) and the disagreement of people in past communities is greater than the disagreements among Muslims.

Thirdly: That which has occurred of disagreement while the Prophet (s.a.w) was sick is the simplest thing and the most clear affair. It come in sound hadith that he said to Aisha while he is terminally ill: : ***“Call for me your father and your brother so that I can write for Abubakar a document by which people will not disagree on after me, then he added: Allah and the believers will not agree that anybody will lead other than Abubakar” (Muslim).*** In another version: ***“A’isha reported that Allah’s Messenger (may peace be upon him) in his (last) illness asked me to call Abu Bakr, her father, and her brother too, so that he might write a document, for he feared that someone else might be desirous (of succeeding him) and that some claimant may say: I have better claim to it, whereas Allah and the Faithful do not substantiate the claim of anyone but that of Abu Bakr” (Muslim).*** When it is Thursday he decided to write the document and Umar said: ***“What is wrong with him? Do you think he is delirious?” (Bukhari).*** So Umar doubt whether what he is saying is due to sickness delirium or is among the things he says normally. Umar feared that it is due to sickness delirium; this is among the things that are ambiguous to him, likewise he was ambiguous about the death of the Prophet (s.a.w), nay he denied it. Some of them said: “bring a paper,” and some of them said: “Do not bring the paper.” The Prophet (s.a.w) at that moment decided that writing would not be beneficial because they are doubtful: Did he dictate it due to changes that sickness brought upon his condition? Or is he sound? The writing may not remove the disagreement and ambiguity and thus he abandoned it. [\[137\]](#) Writing the document is not something that Allah made obligatory upon him or conveying it at that time. If the opposite is the case, he will not abandon what Allah commanded him to convey. What he wanted to write is something that he thinks will be beneficial by preventing disagreement concerning the successorship of Abubakar.

It is among the ignorance of Shia Rafidah that they are claiming that what will be written in that document is about the successorship of Ali. While there is absolutely nothing in the story that indicate that opinion and there isn't any sound hadith known to scholars of hadith conveying that he has made Ali his successor, in like manner as there are sound hadiths indicating to the Caliphate of Abubakar. This, although (Shia Rafidah) are claiming that the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed Ali as his successor with clear, unambiguous texts that cut-off all excuses and pleas. If he has already done so – as claimed by Shia – then there is no need for a document and if those who heard the Prophet (s.a.w) appointing Ali as his successor will not obey him; then it is all the same for they will not obey a document. Therefore, what is the benefit of a written document, if their claims are true?

The Rafidi quoting Shahrastani stated: “The second conflict that occurred while the Prophet (s.a.w) was sick, is that he said: ‘Prepare the army of Usama! May Allah curse whoever stayed back! Some people say: ‘It is incumbent upon us to obey him and Usama has come out (ready to advance).’ Some of them say: ‘His sickness has become intense, and our hearts will not agree to leave him.’”

Our reply is that: This is a fabricated story by consensus of the scholars of hadith, for surely the Prophet (s.a.w) never said: “May Allah curse whoever stayed back!” And there isn't any sound chain of authority to support it. Nay, it absolutely does not have any chain of authority in the books of the scholars of hadith. Nobody among those who are in the army of Usama will refuse to go with him if he advance on and move forward towards the enemy. Nay, it is Usama who stopped advancing when he feared the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he said to the Messenger of Allah: “How can I advance while you are in this situation, asking travellers about you?” Thus, the Prophet (s.a.w) allowed him to remain; if he has insisted that Usama shall move out and advance towards the enemy, he would have move out with the army and nobody under his command will stay back; all of them went with him after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) and nobody stayed back without his permission.

Abubakar is not part of the army of Usama by the consensus of all scholars, but it was narrated that Umar is part of it and as he is going out with Usama's army Abubakar requested him to give him permission to stay back with him for he need him (for some duties in Madina). And he gave him the permission.

When the Prophet (s.a.w) died Abubakar adamantly and ardently insisted that the army of Usama shall advance towards its mission, while the generality of the companions advised him to let him stay back for fear of the enemies surrounding Madina, but he said: "I swear by Allah, I will not fold a flag that has been unfolded by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)."

The men of falsehood and fabrications are claiming that Abubakar and Umar are part of the army and that the aim of the Prophet (s.a.w) is to send them out of Madina so that they will not contest and challenge Ali's successorship. This type of statement can only be fabricated by those who are ignorant of the conditions of the Prophet's companions, and the greatest people who lie intentionally. If that is not the case; it is well known that the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded Abubakar to be leading people in prayers throughout the period of his sickness and all the people are present at that time; if he has appointed somebody as his successor they will obey him. It is well known that the Muhajirun and Ansar are fighting whoever challenges the mission of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and they are the people who aided his religion first and last.

If the Prophet (s.a.w) wants Ali to lead prayer; can anybody stop him? If he wanted him, to lead the pilgrimage over Abubakar and the rest of the companions; can anybody challenge him? If he said to his companions: This is your leader and the one who will succeed me; can anybody be able to stop him from that? He (Ali) is with the generality of the Muslims, among the Muhajirun and Ansar; all of them are obeying the Prophet (s.a.w) and none of them hate him and he did not kill any of their relatives. If the Messenger of Allah's aim is to move them out of Madina with the army of Usama because he fears them, he would have said to his companions: Do not give them vow of allegiance! I wish I know, what the Prophet (s.a.w)

fears? Undoubtedly, Allah has given him victory and honored him and those who are around him are the Muhajrun and Ansar, and if he commanded them to kill their parents and children they will obey him. Allah has revealed the Chapter of Bara'ah (or Taubah; Chapter Nine of the Qur'an) and explained in it the condition and characteristics of hypocrites and identified them to the Muslims and they are humbled, defeated and censured by the Prophet (s.a.w) and his community. Abubakar and Umar are the closest people to him, the most honored to him, the most beloved to him, the most exceptional to him and they accompany him more than anybody both in the day and in the nights. They are the greatest people who always agree with him, love him, follow his commands more ardently and aid his religion (with their wealth, property and person tenaciously). Therefore, how can anybody who has sense believe that those people are hypocrites, while all his companions knew that the he (s.a.w) has nothing to do with the hypocrites; he belittle them and he does not bring any of them close to him after the revelation of the Chapter of Bara'ah. This, and Abubakar is the most respected, the most honored and the most beloved to him.

The Rafidi quoting Sharastani stated: "The third disagreement is about his death."

We reply that: There is no doubt that the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) was ambiguous to Umar at the beginning, but the next day he accepted it and confessed that he made mistake by denying that he is dead and that ended the disagreement. The words of the hadith are not as mentioned by Shahrastani, it come in sound hadiths that: ***"Narrated Ibn 'Abbas: Abu Bakr went out while Umar bin Al-Khattab was talking to the people. Abubakar said, "Sit down, O 'Umar!" But 'Umar refused to sit down. So the people came to Abubakar and left Umar. Abubakar said, "To proceed, if anyone amongst you used to worship Muhammad , then Muhammad is dead, but if (anyone of) you used to worship Allah, then Allah is Alive and shall never die. Allah said: "Muhammad is no more than a Messenger, and indeed (many) Messengers have passed away before him. If he dies or is killed, will you then turn back***

on your heels (as disbelievers)? And he who turns back on his heels, not the least harm will he do to Allah, and Allah will give reward to those who are grateful” (3:144). By Allah, it was as if the people never knew that Allah had revealed this Verse before till Abu Bakr recited it and all the people received it from him, and I heard everybody reciting it (then). Narrated Az-Zuhri: Said bin Al-Musaiyab told me that 'Umar said, "By Allah, when I heard Abubakar reciting it, my legs could not support me and I fell down at the very moment of hearing him reciting it, declaring that the Prophet had died” (Bukhari, Ahmad).

The Rafidi quoting Sharastani stated: “The fourth conflict that occurred after the Prophet (s.a.w) is on leadership and it is the greatest disagreement in the Islamic community, for sword has not been unsheathed due to a principle of Islam, as it has been unsheathed because of leadership in all periods.”

We reply that: This statement is a greatest mistake because – Glory and thanks be upon Allah – swords have not been sheathed against the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and Muslims do not have any conflict during their periods on leadership let alone fighting over it and unsheathing swords! There isn't any unsheathed sword among them due to any religious affairs. The Ansar talked about something which has been objected by the best among them,^[138] such as Usaid bin Hudair, Abbas bin Bishr etc., who are better than Sa'ad bin Ubadah in honor and family background. This is because it comes in sound narrations that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“The best amongst the houses of the Ansar is the house of Bani Najjar. Then the house of Bani Abd al-Ashhal, then the house of Bani Abd al-Harith b. Khazraj, then the house of Bani Sa'ida, and there is goodness in all the houses of the Ansar. Said b. Ubada came to us and Abu Usaid said to him: Did you not see that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) has declared the houses of the Ansar good and he has kept us at the end. Said met Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and said: Allah's Messenger, you have declared the house of the Ansar as good and have kept us at the end, whereupon he said: Is it not***

enough for you that you have been counted amongst the good” (Muslim, Abu Dawud). Thus, the three households that have been

given preference are the household of Bani Najjar, Bani Abdul Ashhal, and Bani Harith bin Khazraj. None of the members of these households has contested for the Caliphate after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). Nay, the men of Bani Najjar such as Abu Ayyub al-Ansari, Abu Talha, Ubay bin Ka’ab etc., all of them did not choose anyone other than Abubakar. And Usaid bin Hudair is the foreman of Ansar on the Day of conquest of Makka, he is in the left hand side of the Prophet (s.a.w) while Abubakar is on his right hand side; he is from Bani Ashhal and he urged people to give vow of allegiance to Abubakar, in the like manner other men of the Ansar urged likewise.

[\[139\]](#) Those who contested the Caliphate among the Ansar are Sa’ad bin Ubadah, Hubbab bin Munzir and a few of them and all of them with the exception of Sa’ad bin Ubadah abandoned their opinion and gave vow of allegiance to Abubakar. Although Sa’ad bin Ubadah is a good, righteous man; but he is not infallible, he has sins – some of which is known by the Muslims – which Allah will forgive him: He is among the denizens of Paradise, and among the first and foremost Muslims of the Ansar (r.a).

What Shahrastani mentioned that the Ansar has agreed upon putting forward Sa’ad bin Ubadah (as successor to the Prophet) is false by the consensus of scholars of hadith and sound hadith have contradicted his claim. Sharastani and those similar to him do not intend telling lies, but they made quotations from the books of those who lied intentionally. What some of them stated that Ali was busy with what the Prophet (s.a.w) commanded him of preparing his body for burial and staying near his grave is a clear lie and it contradicted their claims for the Prophet (s.a.w) was buried in the night and not in the day time. It was said that he was buried in the next night and he never commanded anybody to stay near his grave and Ali never remain near his grave. Nay, he was buried in the house of Aisha and Ali is a foreigner to her. Furthermore, how can the Prophet (s.a.w) ask him to remain near his grave, while he has – in accordance to their claims – appointed him to succeed him?

It is not only Ali that work to prepare the Prophet (s.a.w) for burial. Nay, Ali, Abbas, children of Abbas, his client Shaqran, some Ansar, Abubakar and Umar etc., attended to his washing and preparation for burial; at that time they are not at the shed of Bani Sa'adah.^[140] The Sunnah is that the family of the dead are responsible for preparing him for burial. Thus, his family are the people who washed him and they delayed his burial so that Muslims will pray for him, and they prayed for him individually, one after the other, their men and women: They are so many that Monday was not enough for all of them to pray for him after washing him and shrouding him. Therefore, they continued praying for him on Tuesday and he was buried on Wednesday.

Furthermore, the fighting that took place during the time of Ali is not for the Caliphate, this is because the fighting that took place at the battles of the Camel, Siffin and Nahrawan did not take place because the other parties want Ali to be replaced by another person. Mu'awiyah never say: I am the Caliph instead of Ali and Talha and Zubair never said that. Therefore, all the parties that fought Ali did not appoint another Caliph, who they are fighting on his side, in obedience to him before the issue of the appointed two arbitrators comes up. Thus, the battles did not take place on the basis of any principle of leadership (Imamah) that is being contested. None of the fighters is fighting on the basis of rejecting the three Caliphs, nobody claim Divine appointment to the Caliphate for nobody opposes them on that basis and they did not fight on the basis of rejecting the Caliphate of Ali.

The issue that is being contested with regard to the Caliphate, such as what is being contested by sects like Shia Rafidah, the Kharijites and the Mu'atazilites etc., are absolutely not contested and fought for by any of the companions and nobody among them say: The leader that has been Divinely appointed is Ali; nobody among them say: The Caliphate of the first three Caliphs is false or is not right; and nobody among them say: Whoever love Ali and Uthman and support them is an unbeliever. Therefore, the claim of the claimant that the first sword that has been unsheathed among Muslims, was

unsheathed on the basis of the principle of Imamah (leadership), which has been contested and disagreed upon is clearly, an apparent false claim, which falsity is arrived at by little pondering over in association with having knowledge of what really happened. The fighting are nothing but trial and tribulation in accordance to the views of many scholars, and according to many of them it is on issues of fighting between people of justice and people of aggression. They are fighting that are based on interpretations of obeying other than the supreme leader, and thus they are not based on any principle of religion. If it has happened that some people have contested the Caliphate against Uthman and he fought them, his fighting them will be like the fighting that Ali has fought, although there isn't any disagreement between him and those people on any religious principles.

In reality the first sword that has been unsheathed on the basis of conflict on principle of religion is the sword of the Kharijites; their fighting was a great fight and they are the people who innovated statements that contradicted the beliefs of the Prophet's companions and fought on its basis. They are the people upon whom sound concurrent hadiths comes from the Prophet (s.a.w) mentioning them, such as: Abu Sa'id al-Khudri reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: ***“There would be two groups in my Ummah, and there would emerge another group (seceding itself from both of them), and the party nearer to the truth among the two would fight them (the group of the Khwarij)” (muslim, Abu Dawud).***

Ali did not fight anybody in opposition to his being the supreme leader (Caliph) and nobody fought him because he is the Caliph (or because he is not suitable to be the Caliph) and nobody ever claim that he deserved to be the Caliph more than him, during the period of his Caliphate: Aisha never claim that, nor does Talha, Zubair, Mu'awiyah and his companions and neither the Kharijites. Nay, all the Islamic community accepted and believe in the virtues of Ali, his suitability and the person who deserved the Caliphate after the murder of Uthman and nobody among the companions can be

compared to him during his time. Likewise, Uthman does not have comparison among the companions during his Caliphate and nobody, ever among the Muslims contested against his leadership and Caliphate. Nay, two people never argued that other than him more deserved to be the Caliph let alone fighting him over it. The same thing with the cases of Abubakar and Umar. Summarily whoever has knowledge of the condition of the Prophet's companions, knew by necessity that there isn't any argument between two groups against the Caliphate of the three Caliphs, talk less of fighting them.

With regard to the Caliphate of Ali: Two groups never argued that somebody other than him deserved it more than him or is more suitable to be the Caliph (after the murder of Uthman). If there is anybody that hated the Caliphate of any of the four Caliphs that is natural and unavoidable for there are among people some men who hated the Prophethood of Muhammad (s.a.w). Then, how can it be possible not to find people who hate the Caliphate of one of the four Caliphs? It is well known that the Prophet's companions did not fight between themselves on the Caliphate of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman even though they have argued between themselves and thus, it is clear that their differences and arguments did not involve unsheathed swords. It is only during the Caliphate of Ali that swords were unsheathed (between Muslims); so if it is something blameworthy, then the blame is confined in the period on the person in which fighting occurred within the Islamic community (among Muslims). And this is an argument and evidence for the Kharijites and their pleas and proofs are stronger than those of the Shia Rafidah, in the same manner as their swords are stronger than the swords of Shia Rafidah; their religion is more correct and sounder (than that of Shia), they are truthful and they do not tell lies. Despite all these it has come in sound hadiths from the Prophet (s.a.w) and the consensus of his companions that they are innovators, they have erred and they are astray from the right path. Therefore, how about the Rafidah, who are the farthest most people from sense, rationality, knowledge, religion, truthfulness, bravery, asceticism and all

characteristics of goodness? It is not known among all sects that the sect with stronger fighting spirit is the Kharijites, but despite all that they never fight against the Caliphate of Abubakar and Umar. Nay, they have agreed upon their leadership, loving them, supporting them and aiding them.

The Rafidi quoting from Shahrastani stated: "The fifth conflict is: With regard to Fadak and inheritance. It is narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w): 'We the Prophet's do not leave inheritance, whatever we leave behind are charity.'"

We reply: This is a disagreement on an issue of law (jurisprudence). The disagreement has since been resolved. This disagreement or differing in opinion is less than the ones on the issue of different opinions of scholars on inheritance of brothers with the grandfather, the inheritance of grandmother with her son, two brothers preventing mother from inheritance, and making the grandfather with the mother like the father in inheritance and there are many more issues and similar cases on the issues of inheritance in which scholars have different opinions. Ali has become the Caliph after that and Fadak and other properties (that the Prophet left) come under his administration and jurisdiction and he did not hand them over to the children of Fatima. The Prophet's wives and the children of Abbas did not take anything of his inheritance. If what has occurred are injustice, it would have been easier for Ali to lift it and solve it than fighting Mu'awiyah and his army. Do you think that he can fight Mu'awiyah with all that has occurred of great evil and corruption and he will not return to those people a little money, while that is a lighter issue?

The Rafidi quoting from Sharastani stated: "The fifth disagreement is fighting those who refused to pay Zakat. Abubakar fought them and Umar exercised Ijtihad during his Caliphate and returned war booty and captives to them, in addition to releasing those who are imprisoned."

We reply that: This is a lie to those who know the conditions of Muslims (at that time). Undoubtedly, both Abubakar and Umar have agreed upon fighting them after Umar has argued with him over it. It

comes in a sound hadith as follows: ***It is narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that when the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) breathed his last and Abubakar was appointed as his successor (Caliph), those amongst the Arabs who wanted to become apostates became apostates. Some others refused to pay Zakah. At this point Abubakar (may Allah be pleased with him) delivered a sermon encouraging the Sahabah (Companions of the Prophet) to fight the apostates until they came back to Islam. `Umar argued with him saying: "How will you fight those who bear witness that there is no God but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah?" Abubakar replied: "We have been commanded to fight against people until they testify that there is no God but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah. If they do that, their blood and property are guaranteed protection on our behalf except when justified by law." Then Abubakar went on to say: "Is not Zakah one of Allah's Rights? By Allah, I will keep fighting those who differentiate between Salah and Zakah. By Allah, if they refuse to give me as much as a she-kid which they used to give during the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah, I will fight them on its account. Then `Umar said: "It was nothing but Allah Who had guided Abubakar to fight and I came to realize that he was right"(Bukhari, Muslim).***

Therefore, Umar and all the companions have agreed with Abubakar on fighting the apostates and those who refused to pay Zakat.^[141] Those people accepted to continue paying it after their initial refusal. Their progeny and family were never taken as war captives and none of them is imprisoned. Nay, there is not any prison in Madina neither in the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) nor at the time of Abubakar. Therefore, how can anybody say that Abubakar has died leaving some imprisoned prisoners in Madina?

The Rafidi quoting from Sharastani stated: "The seventh disagreement is on Abubakar appointing Umar to succeed him. Among people there are those who said: 'You have appointed upon us the harsh and ruthless.'"

We reply that: Who made this type of voicing opinion a disagreement?^[142] This type of objection has occurred during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) for some people objected over the leadership of Zaid bin Haritha over an army, so also the appointment of his son Usama over an army detachment. Some people used to find fault over the appointees of Abubakar and Umar. Again, the person who made that statement is Talha and he has abandoned that opinion, for he is one of those that greatly respect Umar. Likewise, those who faulted the appointment of Zaid and Usama have abandoned their opinions and adhered to obeying Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w).

The Rafidi quoting Sharastani stated: “The eighth disagreement is on the consultative assembly to choose the next Caliph after Umar. They agreed after disagreeing on the leadership of Uthman.”

We reply that: This is a lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith, for surely nobody disagrees with the Caliphate of Uthman. What happened is that Abdurrahman bin Auf continued consulting people for three days and he informed that people preferred Uthman over others. He stated that he went to the extent of consulting women in their quarters. If there is anybody who hated the Caliphate or said something objectionable regarding it; such objection has not been heard or transmitted and thus, it did not reach us. Some objections always happens in this type of affair and anything in which people are consulted and they speak their minds there might be some unfavorable comments, but we cannot be certain about that by mere conjecture.

Concerning the words of Shahrastani as quoted by this Rafidi: “A lot of conflicts occurred among which is: His bringing back to Madina Hakam bin Umayyah after the Prophet (s.a.w) has expelled him from the city and they used to call him the exiled of the Messenger of Allah. He used to intercede for him during the Caliphates of Abubakar and Umar, but they did not respond to him positively. Nay, Umar exiled him further from the place he is staying in Yemen for a distance of forty miles.”

We reply that: If he is considering this as a conflict, then it means that whenever a leader gives a verdict and some people argued with him regarding it, a conflict has occurred. In this case, if you mention what they differed in, on the issues of inheritance, divorce etc., that will be more correct and more beneficial to the people. Undoubtedly, differences of opinion on those issues have occurred and they have been transmitted by scholars and people are benefitting from them, by recalling them, mentioning them, and debating them; it is differing on general issues and thus it is beneficial to study them, evaluate them and debate them.

The utmost extent of what this Rafidi is mentioning is that they are branches and they cannot be converted into issues in which opinions differed and which people can debate with others in order to increase in knowledge. We say this, although there are a lot of lies in what he has mentioned. Among those lies are what he has mentioned about the issue of Hakam; that he was expelled by the Prophet (s.a.w), and that they used to call him the exiled of the Messenger of Allah; that Uthman intercede for him during the Caliphate of Abubakar and Umar, but they did not respond to him favorably and that Umar exiled him further from where he is staying in Yemen, for a distance of forty miles. Who transmitted this story? Where is its chain of authority? When did he go to Yemen? Why is he exiled to Yemen after the Prophet (s.a.w) – in accordance to their claim he asked him to stay in Ta'if, and it is closer to Makka and Madina than Yemen? If the Prophet (s.a.w) has asked him to stay closer to him; then why was he exiled further to Yemen? Many scholars have mentioned that the story of expelling or exiling Hakam is false, for the Prophet (s.a.w) never exiled him to Ta'if. Nay, he went there (and live there) by himself (and choice) and some people mentioned that he has been exiled and they never mention any sound chain of authority about the story and its cause.

The Rafidi quoting from Shahrastani stated: "Among that is expelling Abu Dhar to Rabzah, he married his daughter to Marwan bin Hakam and he gave him one fifth of the booty of Africa, which is about Two Hundred Thousand Dinar."

We reply that: We have already mentioned the story of Abu Dhar. What is wrong about marrying his daughter to Marwan, to the extent that it became a bond of contention and disagreement? You mentioned that he gave him one fifth of the booty of Africa! Who transmitted this story? It is well known that all the one fifth of the booty of Africa did not reach that amount. We have already mentioned the claims of the Shia Rafida that he has given him One Million Dinar.

The Rafidi quoting Sharastani stated: “He hid Abdullah bin Sa’ad bin Abi Sarh after the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded that he shall be killed and he appointed him as the governor of Egypt.”

We reply that: If he means that the command to kill him is still valid up to the time when Uthman appointed him as the governor of Egypt; - as is understood from his statement – then, such a statement cannot be made except by a person who is extremely ignorant of the history, condition and conducts of the Prophet (s.a.w). Surely, all people have agreed upon the fact that in the year of the conquest of Makka the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded the killing of a number of people, among them is Abdullah bin Abi Sarh, who was brought to the Prophet (s.a.w) by Uthman and he accepted his (repentance) vow of allegiance, after Uthman has interceded for him. Thus, he forgave him and he became among the Muslims whose bloods are sacred; with shared responsibilities; upon him is what is upon them and against him is what is against them.

The Rafidi quoting Shahrastani stated: “His commander of the army is Mu’awiyah, who is also his governor over Syria. His governor at Kufa is Sa’ad bin’As and after him Abdullah bin ‘Amir and Walid bin Uqbah is his governor over Basrah.”

We reply that: Mu’awiyah was appointed by Umar bin Khattab when his brother Yazid bin Abi Sufyan died, to occupy his position and thereafter Uthman increased his area of jurisdiction to encompass all Syria. His conducts and administration of Syria is one of the best conducts and his subjects love him greatly. It comes in a sound hadith the prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“The best of your leaders are those whom you love and who love you, who pray for you and you***

pray for them. The worst of your leaders are those whom you hate and who hate you, and you send curses on them and they send curses on you” (Muslim). The subject of Mu’awiyah loves him and they supplicate for him and he loves them and supplicates for them. With regard to his appointing Sa’ad bin As as the governor of Kufa; it shall be known that the people of Kufa always complained against their governors. Those appointed over them includes Sa’ad bin Abi Waqqas, Abu Musa ‘Ash’ari, ‘Ammar bin Yasir, Mughirah bin Shu’ubah and they complained against all of them one after the other. The conducts and behavior of the people of Kufa are well known. Surely, they used to complain more at the time of Uthman. We have already explained that both Uthman and Ali has given appointments to their relatives and people spoke against Uthman because of that and they also spoke on other issues that have occurred.

The Rafidi quoting Shahrastani stated: “The ninth disagreement: At the time of Ali, after he was agreed upon and vow of allegiance has been given to him. Firstly: Talha and Zubair left for Makka and then move with Aisha to Basrah and they fought him in what is known as the battle of the Camel. This was followed by the disagreement between him and Mu’awiyah which led to the battle of Siffin. Then the renunciation of Amr bin ‘As what is agreed upon between him and Abu Musa ‘al-‘Ash’ari. There is also the disagreement between him and the Kharijites which led to the battle of Nahrawan. Summarily Ali is with the truth and the truth is with him (in relation to all those who disagreed with him). Groups of Kharijites appeared at his time under the leadership of some of his men such as Ash’ath bin Qais, Mu’asir bin Faedaki at-Tamimi, Zaid bin Hissain at-Ta’ie and others. There appeared at his time extremists such as Abdullah bin Saba and from these two groups misguidance and innovations stated. The prophet (s.a.w) has spoken the truth when he said: ‘With regard to Ali, two categories of people will be ruined, namely he who loves him too much and the love takes him away from rightfulness, and he who hates him too much and the hatred takes him away from rightfulness.’ Therefore assess the words of this man

(Sharastani) with fairness; did the causes of tribulation emanate from the three Caliphs or it went beyond them.”

We reply that: This statement showed that Sharastani is with the Shia as mentioned earlier. If this is not the case he has mentioned Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and he did not mention among their traits that the truth is with them and not with those who disagreed with them, but when he mentioned Ali he stated: “Summarily, The truth is with Ali and Ali is with the truth.” Whoever is transmitting knowledge without any bias; will either mention the issues with trust and truthfulness or give everybody what he deserves. With regard to the claim of the claimer that: The truth is with Ali and Ali is with the truth, and making it his specific trait to the exclusion of Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman; such a statement cannot be made by anybody among the Muslims except Shia. What will further inform you that this statement is false are his words: “Surely, disagreements occurred at the period of Ali, after he was agreed upon and he was given the vow of allegiance” It is well known that many Muslims did not give him the vow of allegiance. Many people in Madina and Makka did not give him the vow of allegiance, in addition to those who are far away, such as the people of Syria, Egypt, Iraq, North Africa and khorasan. Then how can this type of statement be made with regard to giving allegiance to Ali and the same thing cannot be stated with regard to giving allegiance to Uthman, which has been agreed upon by all Muslims and nobody disagreed with it! The same thing could be said about his disparagement of Talha, Zubair and Aisha without mentioning any excuse for their action and neither mentioning their repentance. People of knowledge knew that Talha and Zubair never intended fighting Ali and the same thing could be said about the people of Syria; they never aimed at fighting him. Ali also never aimed at fighting any of the two groups.

The battle of Camel took place with neither his intension nor their intention (neither their choice, nor his choice).^[143] They have agreed upon peace and applying the Islamic punishment on those who killed Uthman. The murderers planned to stir up trouble as they have done in the past. They attacked the camp of Talha and Zubair and they

attacked back in self-defense. They made Ali feel that he is being attacked by Talha and Zubair and he fought back in self-defense. The intent of each of the groups is self-defense and not starting a fight. This has been narrated and transmitted by many scholars of history. Therefore, if the fighting occurred from a non-blameworthy perspective; then there is no need to talk about it. And if a mistake or sin has been committed from any of them or both of them; we have explained that that will not prevent what has been stated by the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w); that they are the chosen, pious, friends of Allah, His successful party, His righteous slaves and they are of the denizens of Paradise.

SEGMENT: CONDUCT OF RAFIDA AMONG MUSLIMS IS AIDING UNBELIEVERS AGAINST THEM AND ISLAM

The Rafidi stated: “Therefore, assess the words of this man with fairness; did the causes of tribulations went forth from the Caliphs or went from beyond them.”

We reply that: Tribulations appeared in Islam from the Shia; they are surely the basis and springboard of any tribulation and evil, they are the pivot of all tribulations, strife, sedition, riots, and intrigues. The first sedition that occurred in Islam is the killing of Uthman. Imam Ahmad has recorded in his Musnad that the Prophet (s.a.w) has said: ***“Whoever escapes from the trial of three things has made good his escape; my death, killing an oppressed Caliph unjustly and the Anti-christ.”***^[144]

Whoever assesses and evaluated the history of this world would arrive at the fact that there isn't any group that agrees upon guidance, being on the right course, is sensible and the farthest of all people from sedition, evil intrigues, divisions and disagreements, more than the Prophet's companions. They are the best of creation and the best community as attested and affirmed by Allah, the Most High, when He said: ***“You [true believers in Islamic Monotheism, and real followers of Prophet Muhammad and his Sunnah (legal ways, etc.)] are the best of peoples ever raised up for mankind; you enjoin Al-Ma'ruf (i.e. Islamic Monotheism and all that Islam has ordained) and forbid Al-Munkar (polytheism, disbelief and all that Islam has forbidden), and you believe in Allah. And had the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) believed, it would have been better for them; among them are some who have faith, but most of them are Al-Fasiqun (disobedient to Allah - and rebellious against Allah's Command)”*** (3:110).

In contrast (to the Prophet's companions), the farthest group from guidance and the aid of Allah are the Shia Rafidah, because they are the most ignorant and the most unjust among the sects that attached themselves to Islam. The best of the Islamic community are the

Prophet's companions (r.a); there isn't in the Islamic community any group that agreed upon guidance and the religion of truth and the farthest people from division and disagreement more than them and whatever is mentioned about them of defects relative to the Islamic community is very little.

Whatever each group is suggesting from itself that contradicted Islam is unacceptable; i.e. that group suggests an infallible among the leaders and that group suggests something similar to an infallible leader although they did not call him infallible. They will suggest regarding a scholar or a Sheikh or a leader or a king etc.; due to his much knowledge, religion, good works and many other things that Allah bestowed through him of goodness. They will suggest that nothing is hidden to him, he does not make mistake on an issue, he is out of human nature for he does not become angry. Nay, most of those people are given traits that are not given to Prophets. Allah commanded Prophets Noah (a.s) and Muhammad (s.a.w) to say: **"And I do not say to you that with me are the Treasures of Allah, Nor that I know the Ghaib (unseen); nor do I say I am an angel, and I do not say of those whom your eyes look down upon that Allah will not bestow any good on them. Allah knows what is in their inner-selves (as regards belief, etc.). In that case, I should, indeed be one of the Zalimun (wrong-doers, oppressors, etc.)"** (11:31). Yet, those who follows (scholars or Sheikhs or leaders or kings or Imams) want those that they followed to know everything that they are asked, be able to do whatever they asked to do and be free from all human needs, like the Angels. These suggestions from the followers of some leaders (for the leaders) is like the suggestions and demands of the Kharijites for the whole Muslims; that none of them shall commit any sin and whoever commit any sin – according their belief – is an unbeliever, who will abide in Hell-Fire. All these suggestions and demands are false, they have contradicted what Allah has created and they have contradicted the law of Allah.

There isn't much misguidance and misleading from the right path in any sect of the sects of the Islamic community more than is found among Shia Rafidah. Likewise there isn't guidance, being on the

straight path and mercy in any sect of the sects of the Islamic community more than is found among the people of hadith and absolute Sunnah, who do not support except the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). They are surely his special followers and he is their absolute leader (Imam); they do not follow the words of anybody other than him except if it agrees with his statement. Their goal is aiding Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). Since the Prophet's companions, the people of hadith and absolute Sunnah are foremost in guidance and the religion of truth and the farthest group from misguidance and straying from the right path, it entailed that the Shia Rafidah are on the contrary.

It is now clear that what this man (Shahrastani) mentioned contained falsehood that is very clear to any one that has sense, and nobody can argue with such statements except the ignorant. It also showed that this man has knowledge of Shia creed, that he is affiliated to them and that he believed in their vain desires, by the proof of what he has stated in his book. We say this although he is not among the scholars of hadith and its transmission, he just wrote like those who copied from history books what cannot be relied on by men of intellect and understanding.

Whoever studied the books of hadith, exegeses of the Qur'an, jurisprudence and history will know that the Prophet's companions (r.a) have been leaders of guidance and lights in darkness and that the sources of trial and tribulations, seditions and turmoil are Shia and those who follow them. And that most of the swords that have been unsheathed in Islam (between Muslims) is from their direction and instigation. He will also know that their roots and substances are hypocrites, who created and fabricated lies, innovated corrupt thoughts, views and opinions in order to destroy the religion of Islam and misguide with it the ignorant and those who do not use their intellects. They planned and strived to kill Uthman and that was the first sedition (in Islam), and then they retire to Ali; not because they love him and not because they love the Prophet's household and his progeny, but in order to establish a center of sedition among Muslims.

This is why you find Shia aiding the enemies of Islam, the apostates such as Bani Hanifa the followers of Musailamah the liar and they are saying: Those people have been wronged and oppressed as has been stated by the author of the book under discussion. They also aided and supports Abu Lulu, the Magian unbeliever. It was narrated that he asked Umar to talk to his master about his daily tax (the amount he gives to his master every day). Umar tarry a little, but he has the intention of speaking to him. Then he killed Umar in enmity and hatred to Islam and Muslims, in alliance with other enemies of Islam and love for Fire worship (Zoroastrian religion),^[145] and as a vengeance for the unbelievers, for what he did to them by conquering their countries, killing their leaders and distributing their wealth. Can anybody support and aid Abu Lulu other than the greatest disbelievers in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and in a display of hatred against Islam and Muslims or an ignorant person who does not know the truth about him?

Let us forget about what is heard and transmitted in the past and let every rational, sane person look at what is happening in his time and what is being committed in his time of sedition and corruption in Islam. He will surely uncover that most of it is coming from the side of Shia Rafidah and you will find that they are the greatest people in instigating sedition and evil and causing corruption between the Islamic communities.

We knew by physical witnessing, general concurrent reports and what have happened in our time; for instance when Jakiz Khan, the king of the Mongols appeared, we have seen what has happened in Islam of evil and corruption. No sane person shall doubt that the conquering and taking over of the Muslims countries by the polytheists; what has happened to the relatives of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) among Bani Hashim, such as killing the progeny of Abbas and others, mass killing, shedding blood. Taking Muslims women as war captives and violating their dignity, taking children as war captives, turning them into slaves and taking them out of the religion of Islam to unbelief. Mass killing of men of religion and knowledge among the men of Qur'an and prayer. Exalting and

honoring temples of idols – which they call Bazakhanat, Synogues and Churches (and other shrines of polytheism) – over Mosques, exalting and honoring polytheists and people of the Book and among the Christians over Muslims, in such a manner that the polytheists and people of the Book are greater in honor, their statements are more accepted and they are more sacred than the Muslims and other similar things in which no sane person will doubt that that is more harmful to the Muslims than waging a civil war among themselves. Undoubtedly, if the Prophet (s.a.w) saw what has happened to his community of evil and corruption, he will hate it and be angry with it, more than his hatred and anger over two Muslims fighting over power and authority. This is because none of them has taken the women (and children) of the other party as war captives (and slaves), an unbeliever did not benefit from that and nothing has been nullified or hindered of the concurrent Islamic laws and rituals.

The Shia Rafidah are aiding and supporting those unbelievers and helping them over Muslims and against Islam. People have clearly and physically seen that when Hulagu, the king of the Mongols, the polytheists, unbelievers entered Syria in the year 865 AH. At that time the Shia Rafidah who are in its cities and capitals; among the people of Halab and its environs, the people of Damascus and its environs, are the greatest men who aided him and supported him in establishing his power and authority and carrying out his directives in annihilating power of the Muslims.

Everybody – the masses as well as the men of influence – knew what has happened in Iraq when Hulagu attacked it; the Caliph and uncountable people were killed. At that time the Chief Minister of the Caliph (Vizier), who is called Ibn 'Alqami, become his special adviser and aided him by many ways, both secretly and openly. The same is the conduct of Shia Rafidah against Islam and the Muslims.

Muslims have seen the conducts of Shia Rafidah at the Syrian shores and other places: That whenever Muslims and the Christian (Crusaders) fight, they will side with the Christians and aid them by all possible means. They also hate to see any city of the Christians Crusaders conquered by the Muslims as is the case with the

conquest of Acre and other cities. They prefer to be under Christian administration than that of the Muslims. When the Muslim army was defeated in the year 599AH and Syria was devoid of Muslim army, they spread a lot of corruption in the land and caused a lot of evil; killing people, taking and looting their wealth and properties, carrying and raising flags of the Christians Crusaders, preferring Christian over Muslims and taking Muslims captives, their wealth and their weapons to Christians in Cyprus and other countries (refer to footnote number 15). This and similar conducts of the Rafidah has been seen by people and concurrent reports about it has reached those who have not seen it by themselves. If I have to mention what I have seen and heard of the consequences of their actions, this book will be bulky and other people have information and details of their conducts that I do not know. Their aiding unbelievers against Islam and the Muslims is something that has been seen and witnessed, so also their preference to see that unbelievers defeat Islam and the Muslims. Even if it is assumed the Muslims are unjust and immoral and that they are openly practicing innovations that are greater than cursing Ali and Uthman; it would have been imperative upon men of intellect to evaluate and see what is better among two good things and what is worst among two evil things. If you evaluate the conduct of Ahlus Sunnah you will find that, although they are condemning the creed of the Kharijites, the Rawafids and other groups and sects of innovators; but they do not aid unbelievers against them and they do not choose to see that unbelievers are established over the innovators!

If Shia Rafidah are established they do not fear Allah.^[146] Look at what happened in the state of King Khudabandah – who the Shia Rafidi dedicated his book to – how evil and corruption appeared and spread; if it has continued and become stronger they will have nullified all the Islamic laws! They wanted to destroy the light of Allah with their tongues, but Allah do not accept except that His light is perfected and completed even if unbelievers hated it.

With regard to the rightly guided Caliphs and the Prophet's companions: All the goodness and benefits the Muslims are enjoying

to the Last Day – of beliefs, Islam, Qur'an, knowledge, sciences, religious observances, entering Paradise, escaping from the Hell-Fire, their victories over the unbelievers and the supremacy of the words of Allah over all other religions and sects – are due to the blessings and grace of what the Prophet's companions (r.a) have done. They conveyed the religion and fought on the path of Allah (until they left this world). For every believer who believed in Allah; the Prophet's companions have grace and favor in it to the Last Day. And whatever goodness the Shia Rafidah and other sects enjoy and possess is due to the blessings of the Prophet's companions (and their efforts) and the goodness of the companions follows the goodness of the rightly guided Caliphs for they more are correct and sounder in providing religious and worldly benefits than all the companions. Then, how can such a people be a source of evil, while those Rafidah are the source of goodness? It is well known that the Rafidah loves supports and aid the enemies of the companions (such as Musailamah the liar and Abu Lulu the Magian). Is this anything other than the action of the person whose sight has been blinded by Allah? Allah the Most High said: **"...Verily, it is not the eyes that grow blind, but it is the hearts which are in the breasts that grow blind" (22:46).**

SEGMENT: CONDUCT OF RAFIDA AMONG MUSLIMS AND THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE ON DEALING WITH SECTS AND DISSENTS BASED ON IJTIHAD

*** We are just facing the writer of this book (that we are refuting) and those similar to him among the Shia Rafidah, with some of the things (and atrocities) that they have committed against the predecessors of the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) and those who come after them. Certainly, they come to the best created beings among the first and last (to populate the earth) after the Messengers of Allah and to the best community raised for mankind, and creates for them great sins and turn their good deeds to outrageous evils. Thereafter, they come to the most evil created beings that ascribed themselves to Islam among the sects of innovation and vain desires (those are Shia Rafidah and its branches, its extremists, its Isma'iliyyah, its Zaidiyyah – Houthis – Allah knew and He is the best of those who know that there isn't among the sects of innovators and vain desires that ascribe themselves to Islam any group that is more astray and eviler than them. They are the most ignorant, the most liars, the most unjust, the most closer to unbelief, profligacy and disobedience to Allah and the farthest away from the realities of belief than all other sects) and they claim that they are the chosen people of Allah and that all other people in the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) are unbelievers. They ascribed the whole Islamic community to being astray and unbelief except themselves. This is because they claimed that they are the only sect on the right path, that they will never agree on misguidance and they are the best among the children of Adam. Their similitude is that of a person who come before many sheep and it is said to him: "Give us the best of those sheep so that we can sacrifice it." He went to the most bad of all those sheep; a sheep that is one eyed, lame and lean; which possess neither fat nor marrow and said: "This is the best of all those sheep and sacrificing any other than it is not permissible. The rest of all those sheep are not

sheep but pigs that shall be killed; forwarding them as sacrificial animals is not permitted.”

It come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **“Whoever protect a believer from a hypocrite, Allah will protect his flesh from Hell-Fire in the last Day.”** Those Shia Rafidah are either a hypocrite or an ignorant person. Thus, it is inevitable for a Rafidi or a Jahami to be anything except a hypocrite or an ignorant person with regard to what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has brought (of knowledge and guidance). There isn’t anyone among them who is well versed with what the Prophet (s.a.w) has brought of knowledge and belief in it. Certainly, their opposition to what the Prophet (s.a.w) has brought and their lying against him cannot be hidden to anyone except to an extremist in ignorance and follower of vain desires. Among their scholars who are writing books for them, knew that most of what they are writing are lies (and misguidance), but they are writing for them in order to dominate them. This author (the Rafidi who is being refuted), is being accused by people of writing falsehood, while he knew that it is falsehood, but he is writing for his followers (in order to dominate and control them). If anyone among them knew that what he is writing is false, but he is broadcasting it and maintaining that it is the truth from Allah. Then certainly, he is of the species of the scholars of the Jews who Allah said concerning them: **“Then woe to those who write the Book with their own hands and then say, "This is from Allah," to purchase with it a little price! Woe to them for what their hands have written and woe to them for that they earn thereby” (2:79).** If he believe that what he is writing is the truth; that clearly showed his utmost ignorance and misguidance.

When the predecessors say: “Allah has commanded believers to seek for forgiveness for the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w), but they are being cursed by Shia Rafidah!” This is a sound statement. The same thing with the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w): **“Do not abuse my companions...” (Bukhari),** entailed that abusing them is forbidden. This although the command to seek for forgiveness for the believers and the prohibition of abusing them is general. It comes in

sound hadith that It is narrated on the authority of 'Abdullah bin Mas'ud that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) observed: ***“Abusing a Muslim is an outrage and fighting against him is unbelief” (Muslim).*** Allah the Most High said: **“O you who believe! Let not a group scoff at another group, it may be that the latter are better than the former; nor let (some) women scoff at other women, it may be that the latter are better than the former, nor defame one another, nor insult one another by nicknames. How bad is it, to insult one's brother after having Faith [i.e. to call your Muslim brother (a faithful believer) as: "O sinner", or "O wicked", etc.]. And whosoever does not repent, then such are indeed Zalimun (wrong-doers, etc.)” (49:11).** Allah also said: **“And of them are some who accuse you (O Muhammad) in the matter of (the distribution of) the alms. If they are given part thereof, they are pleased, but if they are not given thereof, behold! They are enraged!” (9:58).** In another verse Allah said: **“Woe to every slanderer and backbiter” (104:1).** When a Muslim supplicates (as commanded by Qur'an): **“And those who came after them say: ‘Our Lord! Forgive us and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who have believed. Our Lord! You are indeed full of kindness, Most Merciful’” (59:10),** he means all believers that have existed before him since the first century of Islam, even if he has committed mistake in interpretation by contradicting the Sunnah, or committing a sin, for he is among his brothers that has preceded him in faith. He will be encompassed by the supplication even if he is one of the twenty seven sects. Certainly, in each sect, there are many people who are not unbelievers, but they are believers although they possess some misguidance and sin by which they deserved Divine threats, in the same manner that all profligate believers deserved it. The Prophet (s.a.w) did not expel them from his community and he did not say that they will abide in Hell forever.

This is a great principle that shall be put into consideration: Certainly, many people who are ascribing themselves to Sunnah possess some innovation similar to the innovations of Shia Rafidah and

Kharijites. The companions of the Prophet (s.a.w) – Ali and the rest of them did not ascribe the Kharijites to unbelief even though they fought them. Nay, in the beginning of their rebellion, when they gathered in a village called Hurawra'a (two miles away from Kufa), thereby renouncing obedience and the community of Muslims. Ali said to them: "You have rights upon us, that we will not deny you access to our mosques and your rights from the state treasury." He then sent Abdullah bin Abbas who debated them. At that moment half of them abandoned their views and he fought (when they started attacking Muslims, killing them and taking their properties) the rest and defeated them. Despite all these he never take their children and women as war captives, he never take their properties as war booties, and he did not deal with them the way apostates such as Musailamah the liar and those similar to him are dealt with.

From Qais bin Muslim, on the authority of Tariq bin Shihab who said: I was with Ali after finishing fighting the Kharijites at Nahrawan. He was asked: "Are they polytheists?" He replied: "They are fleeing away from polytheism." He was asked: "Are they hypocrites?" He replied: "Hypocrites do not remember Allah but little." He was asked: "Then, what are they?" He replied: "A people who committed aggression against us and we fought them." Thus, Ali has clearly explained that they are believers and that they neither polytheists, nor hypocrites. And is this contrary to what some people are saying: – such as Abu Ishaq al-Isfiraini and those who followed him – we only ascribe unbelief to those who call us unbelievers. Certainly ascribing people to unbelief is not their rights, nay it is the right of Allah. It is not permissible for a person to tell lies against the person who is telling lies against him, and it is not permissible to commit illegal sexual intercourse with the family of the person who does so with his family, for that is forbidden; it is the right of Allah. If a Christian abused the Prophet (s.a.w), it is not permissible for us to abuse Jesus (a.s) and Shia Rafidah ascribed Abubakar and Umar to unbelief, it is not allowed for us to ascribe Ali to unbelief. ***Sufyan narrated from Ja'afar bin Muhammad, on the authority of his father (Baqir), who said: "Ali***

heard (on the day of the battle of the Camel or Siffin) a man going to the extreme in his utterances and he said: 'Do not utter anything but good, for they are a people who claimed that we have committed injustice against them, and we claimed that they have committed injustice against us, and we fought them.'

Makhul said: ***"The companions of Ali asked him concerning those who are killed from the side of Mu'awiyah! What is their state? He replied: they are believers."*** Abdurrahman bin Abi 'Aun said: "Ali passed by those who are killed in the battle of Siffin – while reclining on the body of Ashtar – and they saw Habib al-Yamani among the slaughtered. Ashtar said: 'From Allah we are and to Him is our return. This is Habib al-Yamani among them, O commander of the Faithfuls, and on him is the sign of Mu'awiyah. By Allah, I certainly, knew him among the believers.' ***Ali replied: 'And at this moment he is among the believers.'***"

SEGMENT: GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON WHAT THE PROPHET'S COMPANIONS ARE ACCUSED OR DISPARAGED

*** We will mention some general principle on this issue in relation to the Prophet's companions and all the Islamic community and we say:

It is necessary for man to possess general principles upon which he can refer subsidiary parts in order to be able to speak with justice. He shall know how the subsidiary parts occurs, otherwise he will remain in denial and ignorance of them and ignorance and injustice with regard to the general principles, and this will cause great corruption. People have spoken about appraising the Ijtihad of a Mujtahid with either approval or disapproval; ascribing them to committing sin or absolving them from committing sin on questions based on both principles and branches of religion. We will mention general, comprehensive principles on this matter.

The first principle: Is it possible for every Mujtahid to know the truth through his Ijtihad? Scholars have differed on the answer to this question. If it is not possible for him to know all the truth, but he did his Ijtihad with sincerity and exert all his efforts and yet he missed the truth and say: "I believe that I have deduced the truth on the issue," while in reality it is not the reality on the issue! Does he deserved to be punished or not? This is the root and the main principle on these issues. Scholars have differed into three different opinions on this principle and each opinion has its supporters from among them:

1. Those who said: Certainly, Allah has provided a proof for each issue by which its truth and reality can be known by whoever exerted sincere efforts. Therefore, whoever do not get to know the truth on each issue, whether it is on the fundamental of religion or its branches; it is due to his negligence in carrying out what is obligatory upon him (diligently) or due to his weakness. This is the opinion of Qadriyyah, Mu'atazilites and a group among the scholastic theologians other than those mentioned.

2. Those who said, a sincere Mujtahid, who exerted all his efforts in order to deduce the correct law can possibly make correct deduction and he may fail in his efforts. If he failed in his sincere efforts, he may be punished by Allah or He may forgive him. This is the opinion of the Jahmiyyah, Ash'ariyyah, and many among the Sunni scholars of jurisprudence.

3. Those who said, not everybody that exercise his sincere Ijtihad can be able to know the truth on an issue. And only the person who abandoned what he is commanded to do deserved threats (of punishment). This is the opinion of the generality of the Jurists and the grand scholars. It is also the opinion of the predecessors of the Islamic community and the generality of the Muslims. This opinion encompasses whatever is correct in the first two options.

The second principle: Those who are saying: Allah will not punish in the Hereafter except the person who disobeyed him, by abandoning what he is commanded to do and committing what he is commanded to shun.... The principle which is maintained by the predecessors and the generality of the scholars is that, Allah will not burden a soul beyond what it can be able to do. Therefore, the obligations are conditional upon ability and punishment cannot be applied except if one abandon what he is commanded to do or commit what he is prohibited to do, after clear proof have been established upon him. We have mentioned in other places the verdict upon people concerning promises and threats, recompense and punishments and that the person who committed sins may not be punished in Hell Fire due to about ten reasons. If this is the verdict concerning the Mujtahid, the verdict concerning those who committed sins and the general verdict that encompasses all the Islamic community: Then, how about the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w)? If Mujtahids and sinners of latter generations can be absolved from blame and punishments due to the reasons mentioned: Then, how about the first and foremost Muslims of the Muhajirun and Ansar?

We will explain this issue in details and we will give example with the lowest for the highest and thus, we say: Statements of censure against the Caliphs and other companions – by the Shia Rafidi and

those similar to him – is hinged upon the issues of speaking about the honor and dignity of people. It contained the rights of Allah (upon His slaves) which is hinged upon befriending and enmity, love and hatred and it also contained the rights of human beings. It is well known that whenever we speak concerning those who are less than Prophet's companions, such as rulers who have differed on exercising power and authority and scholars and jurists who have differed on knowledge and religious issues; it is compulsory that we speak concerning them with knowledge and justice and not with ignorance and injustice. Certainly, doing justice is obligatory upon each person to each individual at all times, and injustice is absolutely prohibited and is not allowed in all conditions. Allah the Most High said: **“O you who believe! Stand out firmly for Allah and be just witnesses and let not the enmity and hatred of others make you avoid justice. Be just: that is nearer to piety, and fear Allah. Verily, Allah is WellAcquainted with what you do” (5:8).** Allah the Exalted explained in the above verse that even if you hate a person or you are an enemy to him in accordance to the command of Allah (of being an enemy to His enemy and befriending His friends), you are not allowed to commit an injustice against him. Then, how about instituting enmity against a Muslim by interpretation and ambiguity or vain desires? He more deserved to be treated with justice and not with injustice. The Prophet's companions deserved more to be treated with justice by words and action. All people of the world have agreed upon loving justice, commending it, and praising it and all people of the world have agreed upon hating injustice, censuring and condemning it as an evil act... What we want to explain is that judging with justice is absolutely compulsory; at all times and places and upon each person for each person. Judging with what Allah has revealed to Muhammad (s.a.w) is special justice; it is the most perfect type of justice and the best of it and judging with it is compulsory upon the Prophet (s.a.w) and all those who (believe in him and) follow him. Whoever did not maintain the judgment of Allah is an unbeliever. This is compulsory upon the Islamic community in all things that it disagreed upon on the issues of belief and practices. Allah the Most High said: **“O you who believe! Obey Allah and**

obey the Messenger (Muhammad SAW), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger (SAW), if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination” (4:59). Therefore, the issues that are shared by the Islamic community cannot be judged except with the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w). Thus, nobody shall obligate upon people the statement of a scholar, or a leader or a Sheikh or a king... The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Judges are of three types, one of whom will go to Paradise and two to Hell. The one who will go to Paradise is a man who knows what is right and gives judgment accordingly; but a man who knows what is right and acts tyrannically in his judgment will go to Hell; and a man who gives judgment for people when he is ignorant will go to Hell” (Abu Dawud).*** Therefore, if he judge with knowledge and justice, exert his effort and make Ijtihad and is correct in his judgment, he has two rewards and if he made sincere Ijtihad and erred, he has one reward. This has come in sound hadith, where the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“When a judge judges and strives and is correct, then he has two rewards. If he judges and strives and errs, then he has a single reward” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

Since it is compulsory not to speak about what has occurred between Muslims except with knowledge and justice, after referring the matter to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). Then know that this obligation is foremost on what has occurred concerning the Prophet’s companions... The Shia Rafidah have taken divergent paths concerning the Prophet’s companions; they love some and went to the extreme in their love and they hate some and went to the extreme in their hatred... All these are among the divergence and breaking up into sects which Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) has forbidden. Allah said: ***“Verily, those who divide their religion and break up into sects (all kinds of religious sects), you (O Muhammad SAW) have no concern in them in the least. Their affair is only with Allah, Who then will tell them what they used to do” (6:159).*** And He said: ***“And be not as those who divided***

and differed among themselves after the clear proofs had come to them. It is they for whom there is an awful torment. On the Day (i.e. the Day of Resurrection) when some faces will become white and some faces will become black; as for those whose faces will become black (to them will be said): "Did you reject Faith after accepting it? Then taste the torment (in Hell) for rejecting Faith." And for those whose faces will become white, they will be in Allah's Mercy (Paradise), therein they shall dwell forever" (3:105-107). Abdullah bin Abbas said: "The faces of Ahlus Sunnah will be white and the faces of people of innovation will be black." In a hadith of Abu Huraira the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"certainly, Allah will accept three things from you; that you worship him alone and join no partner in his worship, that you hold fast to the rope of Allah and do not be divided and that you advice those who Allah has made leaders over you"*** (Muslim). Allah has forbidden committing injustice against Muslims, whether they are dead or alive and He has forbidden their blood, wealth, and honor. It comes in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said during the farewell pilgrimage: ***"No doubt! Your blood, your properties, and your honor are sacred to one another like the sanctity of this day of yours, in this (sacred) town (Mecca) of yours, in this month of yours."*** The Prophet repeated his statement again and again. After that he raised his head and said, 'O Allah! Haven't conveyed (Your Message) to them'. Haven't I conveyed Your Message to them? is incumbent upon those who are present to convey this information to those who are absent, for may be the person who is informed will understand more than the one listening" (Bukhari). Allah the Most High has said: ***"And those who annoy believing men and women undeservedly, bear on themselves the crime of slander and plain sin"*** (33:58). Whoever harms a believer, whether he is dead or alive, without any right, such action has been encompassed by this verse out of necessity. Whoever is a Mujtahid, has not committed any sin and if somebody harms him, he has harmed him unjustly without committing any sin. Whoever committed a sin and he has sought Allah's forgiveness for his sin or Allah has forgiven

him due to other reasons in such a manner that he will not be punished in the Hereafter and somebody harmed him, he has harmed him with what he did not earn. Allah the Most High has said: **“O you who believe! Avoid much suspicions, indeed some suspicions are sins. And spy not, neither backbite one another. Would one of you like to eat the flesh of his dead brother? You would hate it (so hate backbiting). And fear Allah. Verily, Allah is the One Who accepts repentance, Most Merciful” (49:12).** It come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Slander is mentioning your brother with what he hates. He was asked: How about if my brother has the bad trait I have mentioned against him? He replied: if your brother has the bad trait, you have slandered him and if he does not possess the bad trait, you have lied against him” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Therefore, whoever made false allegations against a person has lied against him. Then, how about if the false allegation is concerning the Prophet’s companions? Whoever say concerning a Mujtahid: Certainly, he has committed injustice or he intentionally decided to disobey Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), and or to disagree or go contrary to the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w) – and in reality that is not the truth – has certainly, lied against him and if the allegation against him is true, he has certainly, slandered him.

Allah and His prophet (s.a.w) allow some forms of speaking against the honor and dignity of people. These forms are hinged upon retaliation, justice, what is required for religious benefits and advising Muslims. The first type is the statement of the complainant that so and so has beaten me, he has taken my wealth or he refused to give me my right etc., Allah the Most High said: **“Allah does not like that the evil should be uttered in public except by him who has been wronged. And Allah is Ever AllHearer, AllKnower” (4:148).** The verse was revealed concerning a guest who visited some people and they did not entertain him with sustenance, for feeding a guest is obligatory as indicated by sound hadiths. When they refused him his right, it is allowed for him to mention that omission... With regard to

needs, like the taking of needs and necessities by Hind bint 'Utba as mentioned in sound hadith: ***“Aisha reported: Hind, the daughter of 'Utba, wife of Abu Sufyan, came to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) and said: Abu Sufyan is a miserly person. He does not give adequate maintenance for me and my children, but (I am constrained) to take from his wealth (some part of it) without his knowledge. Is there any sin for me? Thereupon Allah's Messenger (s.a.w) said: Take from his property what is customary which may suffice you and your children” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** In this instance the prophet (s.a.w) did not object to her statement for it is a form of complaining by the oppressed. With regard to giving good advice, we have the like of what the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Fatima bint Qais, when she sought his advice concerning those who sought her hand in marriage. Fatima bint Qais (r.a) reported that her husband divorced her with three pronouncements and Allah's Messenger (s.a.w) made no provision for her lodging and maintenance allowance (against the former husband). She (further said): Allah's Messenger (s.a.w) said to me: ***When your period of 'Idda is over, inform me. So, I informed him. (By that time) Mu'awiyah, Abu Jahm and Usama b. Zaid had given her the proposal of marriage. Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: So far as Mu'awiyah is concerned, he is a poor man without any property. So far as Abu Jahm is concerned, he is a great beater of women, but Usama bin Zaid... She pointed with her hand (that she did not approve of the idea of marrying) Usama. But Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: Obedience to Allah and obedience to His Messenger is better for thee. She said: So I married him, and I became an object of envy” (Muslim).*** Thus, when she sought his advice concerning who to marry, he informed her what she need to know about the men. Giving good advice is commanded even if the person did not seek for it. In a sound hadith that the prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Religion is sincere advise (three times). They asked: For who, O Messenger of Allah? he replied: For Allah, His Book, His Messenger (s.a.w) and for the leaders of Muslims and their generality” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** The same

thing is applicable and is applied concerning making explanation by scholars concerning mistakes made while narrating hadiths or intentional lies against the Prophet (s.a.w), or lying against those who transmitted knowledge from him. The same thing is applicable concerning the mistake that a scholar made in his opinion concerning a religious issue, whether theoretically, scientific or practical. On these types of issues, if a person speak with knowledge and justice, with the aim of giving sincere advise for the sake of Allah, he will be recompensed for that action. This, especially if the person making the statement is inviting people to innovation; it is compulsory to explain to the people his affairs, for protecting them from his evils is greater than protecting people from the evils highway robbers.

The verdict upon the person who is speaking with his Ijtihad, on issues of knowledge and religion is like the verdict of those similar to him of the Mujtahids. A Mujtahid may err or be correct; each of the two men that differed on the basis of their Ijtihads – with the tongue (speech) or with the hand (fighting) – may believe that the truth is with him. They may all be wrong and forgiven by Allah. We have mentioned similar cases on what has taken place between the Prophet's companions. That is why it is forbidden to speak about what has occurred between those people, whether they are the companions or those who come after them. If two Muslims have fought on an issue that has passed and (the present) people have no linkage or relationship with it and they do not know the truth on how (and why) it occurred; it is talking without knowledge and justice and it entailed harming them (their dignity and honor etc.) without right: Even if they knew that they have committed sins, or mistakes, mentioning that – without preponderate benefit – is a form of forbidden slander. The Prophet's companions have greater sacrosanctity, mightier estimation and purer dignity and honor. Their virtues have been affirmed and confirmed – both specifically and generally – in such a manner that it has not been confirmed for other people, and this is why talking and censuring them on what has

occurred between them is greater sin than talking about other people and censuring them.

If it is said: You people – at present – are censuring Shia Rafidah, abusing them, disparaging them and mentioning their faults! We reply that: Mentioning types of evils and sins is not mentioning particular people. It comes in sound hadiths of the Prophet (s.a.w) that he cursed many types of sins and evils... Allah the most High said: “... **The Curse of Allah is on the Zalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers, etc.). Those who hindered (men) from the Path of Allah, and would seek to make it crooked, and they were disbelievers in the Hereafter**” (7:44-45). Thus, the Qur’an and Sunnah are full of censuring types of evils and sins, cursing those who commit them, warning people from doing that, and informing them about the threats and the consequences that will befall those who commit them. The sin that people commit and they knew that it is sin, they will repent from it. The innovator that thinks he is right and on the right path – such as the Kharijites and the Nawasibs, who have declared war against the community of Muslims – have innovated innovations by which they ascribe whoever did not agree with them on it to unbelief. Thus, their harm to Islam is greater than the injustice of the unjust who is aware that injustice is forbidden... The Shia Rafidah are greater innovators than the Kharijites and they are excommunicating from Islam those who the Kharijites are not excommunicating, such as Abubakar and Umar, and they are also telling lies against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his companions (r.a) in such a manner that they are not surpassed by anyone. The Kharijites do not tell lies and they are more truthful, braver, they fulfill their promises and they fight greater than the Shia Rafidah. The Shia Rafidah are more liars, more cowards, more weak and docile and more betrayers of trust than any other sect; they are a people who always seek the aid of the unbelievers against the Muslims. They aided Genghis Khan, the king of the polytheists, unbelievers, the Mongols against the Muslims. Their giving aid to Hulagu and his son when they attacked Khorasan, Iraq, and Syria is clearer and more notorious (in such a manner that it cannot be

covered or hidden or defended). The Shia in Khorasan and Iraq are their greatest aids, both openly and secretly and the Rafidi chief Minister, in Bagdad who is called Ibn 'Alqami is one of them. He continued to deceive the Caliph and the Muslims and devised means of cutting down the salaries and provisions of the armies thereby rendering it weak. He prohibited the generality of the people from fighting the Mongols and committed other forms of evil devises and these gave the enemies the ability to enter Bagdad, ransack it and killed more than eight hundred thousand Muslims. No massacre and human slaughter has been committed against Muslims similar to that massacre, which was committed by the polytheists Mongols (Tartars) in Bagdad with the aid of Shia Rafidah, where they killed Banu Hashim and Banu Abbas (members of the household of the Prophet) and other people. They also took their women and children as captives. Can a person who claims to love the family of the Prophet (s.a.w) aid and support unbelievers to kill them and take them as war captives (turning them into slaves) and kill other Muslims? And they are telling lies against Hajjaj and other rulers that they have killed members of the Prophet's family, while Hajjaj has never killed any Banu Hashim, although he is an unjust oppressor, for Caliph Abdulmalik has forbidden him from doing that – but he killed from other noble Arab clans other than the Banu Hashim. Hajjaj has married a woman from Banu Hashim – the daughter of Abdullah bin Ja'afar – but Banu Umayyah refused to accept that marriage and they separated them, saying: Hajjaj is not a match to a noble Banu Hashim woman.

Among the Shia Rafidah there are those who are devoted worshippers, pious and ascetics, but they are not up to the degree of other sects of vain desires and innovations: The Mu'atzilites are more rational and intelligent than them; they are knowledgeable and more religious, profligacy and lying is lesser among them than among the Shia Rafidah. The Shia Zaidiyyah are better than Shia Rafidah and they are closer to the truth, justice and knowledge. There is no sect among the sects of vain desires and innovations that are more truthful, and more devoted to religion than the

Kharijites. Despite all (what we have mentioned concerning Shia Rafidah) these, the Ahlus Sunnah are treating them with justice and fairness and they do not commit injustice against them, for injustice is absolutely forbidden, as already explained. Nay, Ahlus Sunnah – to each of those groups and sects – are better and more fairer to them, than the manner with which they treat themselves. Nay, Ahlus Sunnah are more just, better and fairer to Rafidah than the treatment of Rafidah amongst themselves (or between their denominations). This is among the things that they are confessing saying: “You are treating us fairly in a manner that we do not treat each other.” That is because the basis of their association is a false principle that is hinged upon ignorance and injustice. Shia Rafidah are associated with committing injustice against all Muslims and thus, they are like highway robbers who are associated in committing injustice against all people. Certainly, a just learned Muslim is fairer to them, than they to each other. The Kharijites are ascribing Ahlus Sunnah to unbelief, most of the Mu’atazrites are excommunicating those who differed with them from Islam and the same thing is applied to most of the Shia Rafidah. Those among them who do not excommunicate Ahlus Sunnah from Islam are ascribing them to profligacy and deviation (from the right path). The same thing could be said about most of the sects of innovation and vain desires, for they innovate an opinion and excommunicate from Islam anyone who differed with them on what they have innovated. Ahlus Sunnah are following the truth that come to them from their Lord, through His Messenger (s.a.w), and they do not excommunicate from Islam those who differed with them in an opinion. Nay, they are more knowledgeable concerning the truth and more merciful to human beings, in the manner that Allah the most High described the Muslims: **“You [true believers in Islamic Monotheism, and real followers of Prophet Muhammad and his Sunnah (legal ways, etc.)] are the best of peoples ever raised up for mankind; you enjoin Al-Ma'ruf (i.e. Islamic Monotheism and all that Islam has ordained) and forbid Al-Munkar (polytheism, disbelief and all that Islam has forbidden), and you believe in Allah. And had the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) believed, it would have been**

better for them; among them are some who have faith, but most of them are Al-Fasiqun (disobedient to Allah - and rebellious against Allah's Command)” (3:110). Abu Huraira said: “You are the best of people for people.” Ahlus Sunnah are the fineness, selected Muslims and therefore, they are the best people for the people.

CHAPTER THREE: PROOFS OF SHIA RAFIDA ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING INFALLIBILITY OF ALI AS PROOF TO HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The Third Chapter: On the proofs that proved the leadership (Imamah) of Ali after the Prophet (s.a.w). There are uncountable proofs on that, but we only mention its most important. We will arrange the chapter on four basic principles. The first principle is on intellectual proofs and they are five:

The first principle: It compulsory that the leader shall be infallible and once this is accepted, that leader is Ali (there are a number of premises to support this principle as follow):

The first premise: Since man is social by nature, he cannot be able to live alone, for he need for his existence what to eat, drink, wear and shelter to live in and he cannot be able to do all these things by himself. Nay, he requires the aid of other people, in such a way that each of them will aid the other to attain his needs and this is the way human beings are sustained. Since living in a society may lead to mutual overpowering and mutual cheating for each person may need what someone else possess and he might be led by his animalistic urge to take it, or seize it or overpower him over it, and commit injustice against him in it. That will lead to occurrence of turmoil and upheavals and sedition will be instigated in the society (by different interest groups). Therefore, it is compulsory (upon Allah)^[147] to appoint an infallible leader (Imam) who will prevent them from committing injustice, overstepping the limits, overpowering each other, be fair to the oppressed against the oppressors and deliver rights to those who deserved them. And he shall be a person who do not commit mistakes, forgetfulness or sin, otherwise he will need another leader because what caused the necessity of an infallible leader is the possibility of the community to fall into mistake. Thus, if he can also commit mistake, he will need another leader and if that one is infallible, he will naturally be the leader otherwise a vicious circle will persist.

The second premises: This is very clear because Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman are not infallible by consensus and Ali is infallible and

therefore he is the leader.”

We reply that: All the two premises are false. With regard to the first premise, he stated: “It is compulsory (upon Allah) to appoint an infallible leader (Imam) who will prevent them from committing injustice, overstepping the limits, overpowering each other, be fair to the oppressed against the oppressors and deliver rights to those who deserved them, and who do not commit mistakes, forgetfulness or sin...”

It will be said to him: We say, in accordance to this premise, if it is true; then surely the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is the infallible leader whose obedience is obligatory at all times, upon every individual and the knowledge of the Islamic community concerning his commands and prohibitions are more perfect and more complete, than the knowledge of individuals in the Islamic community about what your leaders, such as the hidden leader (the awaited Mahdi) whose command and prohibitions are not known. This is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), he is the infallible leader and the Islamic community knew his commands and his prohibitions and their infallible leaders end with the hidden, none existing (awaited Mahdi); it is well known that even if he is infallible nobody know what he is commanding and what he is forbidding. Nay, even the subjects of Ali, did not know what he is commanding and what he is forbidding, in such a manner that the Islamic community knew what its Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded and prohibited. Nay, the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) possessed the knowledge of what he commanded and what he has prohibited, to the extent that they do not need a leader other than him, and in such a way that they do not need any leader with authority over them to teach them their religion, nor do they need in practicing their religion any other infallible guide. The Muslims knew the commands and prohibitions of their Prophet (s.a.w) more than the followers of none existing infallible leader, and even if his existence is established, his commands are not known.

It is well known that none of those who are claimed to be infallible attains power and authority except Ali. We also absolutely and certainly knew that his subjects in Yemen and Khorasan and other

countries do not know what he has commanded or what he has forbidden. Nay, his appointees and governors have been doing what he did not know. But the heirs who have inherited the knowledge of Muhammad (s.a.w) knew his commands and his prohibitions and they believe in what has been transmitted from him in a greater measure than the knowledge of the appointees of Ali with his commands and prohibitions and their belief in what has been transmitted from him.

Shia Rafidah are saying that: It is obligatory to have an existing infallible leader (Imam). We say that: This statement is false from many perspectives:

Firstly: There isn't in existence a leader who has been described by these characteristics (he does not make mistake, commit sin or err or forget) and nobody claimed them for himself. Nay, he is a hidden, lost, and never found leader to those who believe in him and he is none existent and unreal to men of intellect. The goal and objectives of leadership cannot be realized through this type of person; nay whoever become a leader with power and authority upon people – even if he is ignorant and practice some injustice – is more beneficial to them, than a person from who no benefit of any kind can be obtained.

Those who are ascribing themselves to an infallible cannot be able to seek for aid in their affairs except from other than him. Nay, they are ascribing themselves to the infallible, but in reality, they are seeking for aid from an unbeliever or from an oppressor. Therefore, those who believe in this awaited infallible leader did not benefit from him either in their religion or in their worldly issues and nobody benefitted from him in any of the goals of leadership. If nothing of the benefits and objectives of leadership can be obtained from the one it is sought, then there is no need for us to maintain the medium because a medium is only desired for its purpose and goals. If we are sure and certain that the goals cannot be realized; then talking about the medium is false, and a wasted effort. That will be like the person who says: People need someone who will feed them and quench their thirst; the food shall possess such and such a form and

the drink shall possess such and such a form and this can only found with such and such a group and that group is known to be one of the poorest people and they are well known to be bankrupt. What is the benefit of seeking what we knew does not exist? What is the benefit of following what absolutely cannot be beneficial to us? A leader is needed for two things: Either for knowledge; by teaching it and transmitting it, or by putting knowledge into practice; by aiding people to do that with power and authority. This awaited leader is not beneficial in either of the case. Nay what they (Shia claim) possess of knowledge are the statements of those before him. With regard to action: If it is something acceptable to the Muslims, they seek their aid, if otherwise, they will seek the aid of unbelievers and atheists and those similar to them. They are the weakest in acts and actions and the most ignorant people in knowledge although they are claiming that they are followers of the infallible, whose goal is to attain knowledge, power and ability, but they obtain none of them; thus the infallible do not possess knowledge and power.

All the goals of leadership have not been obtained from any of the twelve Imams. If you exclude Ali Ibn Abi Talib; whatever people obtain from the rest of the Imams of knowledge and religious observances, they also obtain it from scholars similar to them. Ali bin Husain, his son Muhammad Baqir and his grandson Ja'afar bin Muhammad as-Sadiq used to teach people what Allah has taught them, in the like manner that He has taught other scholars of their time. And at their periods there are those who are more knowledgeable than them and more beneficial to the Islamic community than them. This is a well known fact among the scholars and if it happens that they are more knowledgeable or more religious, then it shall be known that the benefits that are obtained from men of knowledge and religion do not reach the benefits that are obtained from those who possess power and authority; such as compelling people to adhere to the truth and preventing them with force from falsehood.

After those three, there come other Shia Imams especially the Askariyain (the Shia tenth and eleventh Imams); those people do not

possess knowledge that can be benefitted by the Islamic community and they do not possess power by which the Islamic community can be aided. Nay, they have honor and status of all other members of Bani Hashim. Among them, there are those who have some knowledge of religion and Islam that is required and this is known by most of the Muslims masses. But they do not possess what has been specialize by men of knowledge and that is why students and scholars did not take knowledge from them, in the manner that they learned and took knowledge from those three. If they possess knowledge, it would have been taken from them; but student knew what he need (and where to find it).

People usually accept men that have honored lineage. Did not you see how Abdullah bin Abbas is known by the Islamic community because he possessed much knowledge and people benefitted from him immensely and he is known as man of knowledge by everybody? The same thing can be said about Imam Shafi'i, when people knew that he has knowledge of jurisprudence that they can benefit from, they went to him and benefitted from him, and he is today mentioned as man of knowledge and jurisprudence. If a person cannot get what he wanted from a place, he will not seek it there. Didn't you see that if a person is called a doctor or grammarian, he will be exalted and if doctors and grammarians come to him and found that he does not know medicine or grammar they will abandon him and the claims and exaltations of the ignorant will not benefit him?

Those Shia Imamiyyah learned from the Mu'atazilites that enablement, empowerment, establishment and grace^[148] are compulsory upon Allah, so that the person who is obligated to observe religious precepts will be closer to guidance and farthest away from evil and corruption and that he shall be enabled on the situations. Thus, they said: "Surely leadership (Imamah) is obligatory and to them it is a greater obligation than Prophethood – because it is grace in discharging responsibilities and commandments of Allah." They further stated: "We certainly knew by custom, tradition and passage of time, that any group that has a leader, who is awe

inspiring (venerated), obeyed, have power and authority and is outstretched; are closer to goodness and the farthest away from evil and if they do not have a leader turmoil and confusion will occur between them; they will be the farthest away from goodness and closer to evil and corruption. This condition is felt and realized by the verdict of intellect.” They further maintained that: “If this grace in discharging responsibilities and commandments of Allah; then it must be compulsory.” Thereafter they mentioned his (the leaders) characteristics among which are infallibility etc.

Some of the Shia Imamiyyah asked themselves a question saying: “If you say that a leader is a grace and he is absent (hidden) from you, where is the attained grace although he is absent? And his grace cannot be attained while he is absent (hidden) and at the same time discharging the commandment of Allah is obligatory; this entailed that a leader being a Divine grace in religion is false and hence believing in the leadership of an infallible is false?” They answered the question saying: “We maintain that grace from the leader is obtained while he is hidden (absent), in the same manner that it is obtained while he is physically present. Therefore, it is those who do not believe in his leadership who are denied his grace. In like manner the grace of knowledge of Allah will not be known by the one who do not know Allah the most High, but it is obtained by those who believe in him.” They said: “This answer has expunged the questions and therefore, it is obligatory to believe in the leadership of the infallible.”

We said to them: If grace can be obtained while the leader is hidden, in the same manner that it is obtained while he is physically present, it is compulsory upon them to dispense with his physical appearance and follow him until they die and this has contradicted their beliefs. They replied saying: “The grace while the leader is hidden to those who believe in him is a form of avoidance, shunning and eschewing evil deeds, just like in the condition of his physical appearance. We only obligated his appearance in other matters such as aiding believers against those who oppress them, taking money from the hands of oppressors and placing it in its right place, removing

injustice that cannot be removed through him and fighting the unbelievers for that cannot be performed except with his appearance.”

We say to them: Firstly: Those statements are clearly false; this is because the leader (Imam) that you have as a grace is the one that has been realized by the verdict of intellect and custom. This is what you have stated: “Surely any group that has a leader who is awe inspiring (venerated), obeyed, have power and authority and is outstretched; they are closer to goodness and the farther away from evil.” Thereafter you made it conditional upon infallibility, saying that: “The desired restrain cannot occur except with it.” Now, it is well known that those who have existed before the awaited hidden Imam have never possess any of those characteristics and none of them has ever been either outstretched nor possessor of authority and power. Imam Ali become the Caliph, but his authority and power and outstretched has not been like that of those who passed before him. The rest of them (Shia Imams) have never had outstretched hands and neither power and authority. Nay whatever happens to them has also occurred to those similar to them among the scholars.

With regard to the hidden awaited leader; nothing has been benefitted from him. Therefore, the one who believe in his existence; if he understood that he is hidden for more than One Thousand One Hundred Years and that he fears for his life and therefore, it is not possible for him to physically appear;^[149] let alone to execute the laws of Allah! He cannot be able to command anybody to do anything or to forbid him from doing anything and thus, by this turmoil, confusion and evil will persist - in accordance to Shia beliefs. This is why the sects of Shia Rafidah are the greatest groups with turmoil, confusion, dissention, evil and disagreement with the tongue and conflict with hands and there exist between them fighting with each other, disagreements and conflicts with each other and committing injustice to each other to an extent and degree that cannot be found among those who are being ruled by an unbeliever let alone those who are being ruled by a Muslim?

With regard to their words: "Grace from the leader is obtained while he is hidden (absent), in the same manner that it is obtained while he is physically present." We say: This is nothing but clear arrogance, for if he is physically present he will be beneficial in executing Islamic laws, commanding the doing of good and forbidding the doing of evil etc., which will necessitate the grace, which will not be obtained without his physical presence.

There making a similitude of their hidden leader with the knowledge of Allah in the area of grace and stating that: "His grace will only reach those who believe in him," is a false analogy; for surely belief in the existence of Allah, that He is the Ever-Living and that He can be able to do all things, He commands obedience and He recompense those who are obedient to Him, He forbids disobedience to Him and He punish whoever disobey Him; are of the greatest means of coveting and hoping for His mercy and fearing His punishment. Therefore, this knowledge makes man to hope and covet for His recompense, by doing what he is commanded to do and abandoning what he is forbidden to do and it will make him fear his punishment if he disobeys Him, because man knew that He is All-Knowing and Able to do all things and that it is His Sunnah (custom or way of doing things) to recompense those who are obedient and punish those who disobeyed.

With regard to a person who the people knew he is missing for more than one thousand and one hundred years and that he has no power to punish anybody, nor can he able to recompense anyone. Nay, he is in perpetual fear for himself (for his life) if he appears; then what more of commanding people to do good acts and forbidding people to shun evil acts and how can knowing (believing) in him lead to doing what he has commanded and abandoning what he has forbidden? Nay, the knowledge that he is weak and fearful will necessitate people to commit evil especially due to long period and passage of time; period after period and he never punish anybody, nor recompense anyone.

If it happens that he used to appear after every one hundred years and apply some punishments, benefits and grace will not be

obtained from him as it is obtained from individual leaders (who are living among their subjects). Nay, even if it said that he appears after every ten years, nay even if he appears every year once, his benefit will still not reach the benefits that are obtained from leaders who are physically present at all times. Nay, those leaders, - with all their sins and injustice in some issues – Allah has decreed with them what they execute of punishments and the efforts that they make in urging people to obedience are many times better than that of the one who appear after every period. Then what about the missing leader; concerning who it is certain to all men of intellect that he does not exist and those who believe in him knew that he is weak, full of fear and never do what is being done by individual men, not to speak of (what) their leaders (have done)!

What awe inspiring qualities does this leader possess? What obedience? What power and authority? What outstretched hands does he possess? (You Shia stated): “If people have a leader who is awe inspiring, obeyed, has power and authority and is outstretched; they will be closer to goodness and farthest away from evil!”

Whoever ponders over this will realize that those people are extreme in ignorance, arrogance and sophism,^[150] for they make the benefits and grace that are obtained from the weak, hidden and absent leader, the same as the benefits and grace that are obtained from him if he physically exist. And that people shall believe in him although he is weak and fearful and no benefits are obtained from him, as if he exist, able to act and living in peace! And that the mere believe in him is a grace and benefit in like manner that believe in Allah is a grace and benefit.

Secondly: We say: With regard to your statement: “It is imperative to appoint an infallible leader who will do those things!” Do you mean that it is compulsory upon Allah to create someone who possesses those qualities? Or is it compulsory upon people to give vow of allegiance (elect) to someone who possess those characteristics? If you mean the first option: Then surely, Allah has not created anybody with such qualities. The utmost what you can say is that: Surely Ali is infallible, but Allah did not give him power and authority

and He did not establish him and He did not aid him, neither by Himself nor with an army He created for him, so that he can be able to do what you have mentioned. Nay, you people are saying: He was weak, defeated, oppressed and suppressed during the Caliphate of the three caliphs and when he possess authority some army stood in his face and fought him, to the extent that he was not able to do what those who passed before him have done and who are unjust oppressors according to your beliefs. This entailed that Allah has aided those who have been before him, until they are established and did what they have done of benefits, goodness and grace and he is not aided to do similar thing as they have done.

If you say: It is obligatory upon people to give him vow of allegiance and aid him! We reply that: People did not do that whether they have been obedient or disobedient. Upon all considerations, none of those you considered as infallible get any support neither from Allah nor from men. And those benefits you have mentioned cannot occur except with aid and support; if that did not happen, that which through it benefits are attained is not achieved. Nay, it is only the means that exist and that did not bring about what is desired.

Thirdly: If the whole things by which those claims can be attained did not occur, nay most of its preconditions have failed. Then, why shall it not be that infallibility as a precondition has slip away (failed)? If what is aimed at has failed: Either due to lack of infallibility or because the infallible is weak; then there is no difference between the lack of this or that. Therefore, how do we arrive at the theory that it is incumbent upon Allah to appoint an infallible Imam through intellectual process? (Shia Rafidah claimed that) Allah created him (infallible leader) and appointed him so that human beings can attain grace and benefits through him. Now, He has created him weak to the extent that he cannot be able to provide those benefits. Nay, a lot of evil and corruption has occurred, which will not take place except with his existence, and that will be explained by:

Fourthly: If this infallible has not been created (in Shia imagination) a lot of evil and corruption that is going on in the world will not have occurred for his existence has not prevented the occurrence of evil,

so that it can be said: His existence has prevented this or that. Nay, his existence has caused the generality of the people to disbelieve in him, become enemies to his aids and party, commit injustice against him and his companions and a lot of evil has occurred – this, assuming that he is infallible. If we assess that Ali is not infallible and neither the rest of the twelve Imams and others who are similar to them; then taking over authority by the three Caliphs, Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas will not be considered as injustice and evil (by Shia Rafidah). If we assume that they are infallible leaders, by our assumption that they are infallible leaders; then people continued to be in evil and corruption with the exceptions of the corruptions and evils that has been removed by those who are fallible and therefore, their being infallible only caused corruption and not goodness. Thus, how can it be conceivable for the All-Wise to create something in order that benefits, goodness, and grace shall be attained through him, but nothing is attained from him except absolute evil, devoid of all goodness?

If they say: This evil has occurred because people have committed injustice against him! It will be replied to them that: The All-Wise that created him in order to prevent their injustice and He knew that if He created him injustice will increase; thus there is no wisdom in creating him but rather irrationality. This is similar to someone who handed over his son to a person asking him to guide him and teach him and he knew that person will not obey him; nay he will only corrupt his son. Can a wise man do that?

*** The belief of Shia Rafida is similar to the beliefs of the Christians who said that Allah became incarnated (in Jesus) and come down or he sent down His son; so that he will be crucified in order to atone Adam for the sin he has committed and so that Satan will be spited and driven away. It is said to them: If killing him, and crucifying him are greater evil and misguidance, it entailed that Allah want to remove a small sin with greater sins and even then, instead of removing evil He increased it. How can Allah do a thing for a purpose and the opposite of it will occur?

Fifthly: If man is social by nature and appointing an infallible Imam is compulsory so that he can remove injustice and evil from the people of a city. Are they saying: There is in existence in each city that has been created by Allah, an infallible leader who is preventing people from injustice or not? If you accept the first option; then that is clear arrogance (in supporting falsehood). Is there an infallible leader in the countries of the polytheists and people of the Book? Has there been an infallible leader in Syria together with Mu'awiyah? If you reply: Nay, he is the only one for all cities and he has representatives in all cities! It will be replied to you that: Does each infallible possess representatives in all the cities of the world or in some cities? If you replied that he has representatives in all cities; that will be nothing but arrogance (in supporting falsehood). And if you say: He has representatives in some cities only! It will be said: Then what is the difference if what you have mentioned (of appointing infallible leader) is compulsory upon Allah, considering that all cities have the same need for an infallible leader?

Sixthly: This infallible leader! Is he the only infallible? Or is it that all his representatives are also infallible? The Shia Rafidah does not believe in the second option, for if they believe in it that is arrogance. Surely the representatives of the Prophet (s.a.w) are not infallible, and neither the representatives of Ali; nay some of his representatives possess evil and disobedience that is not found among the representatives of Mu'awiyah their leader.^[151] Thus, where is the infallibility? If you say: Infallibility is a precondition for only the leader! It will be said to you: How about the nations far away from the Imam, - especially if the Imam is not able to control and subjugate his representatives. Nay, he is weak – with what will they benefit from the infallibility of the leader; while in reality the fallible (imperfect representative) is leading them in prayers, the fallible is judging between them, they are obeying the fallible and the fallible is collecting their wealth (Zakat and other taxes)? If you said: All issues are referred back to the infallible. It will be replied that: If the infallible possess power and authority in the like manner of Umar, Uthman and Mu'awiyah and other leaders he cannot be able to extend the

necessary justice to all of them by himself. The utmost thing he can do is to appoint over them the best person he can find, but if he cannot find anybody other than a weak and unjust person; how can he be able to appoint a capable just person? If they say: If Allah did not create except the weak or the unjust the legal incumbency has been lifted from him. It will be replied to them that: If it is not compulsory upon Allah to create an absolute just, capable person, but instead of that He made it obligatory upon the leader to do what he can be able to undertake: Likewise it is necessary upon people to appoint the most suitable from among the slaves of Allah the Most High, even if he has some defects: Either from the direction of his ability or from the direction of his justice. Umar used to supplicate to Allah saying: ***“O Allah, I complain to You, the toughness of the profligate and the weakness (inability) of the reliable.”*** And nobody has ruled the world like Umar; then what do you think about other than him? This is said if the man in charge is capable of discharging authority and is just; then how about if the infallible is weak and incapable of discharging authority? Nay, how about if he is lost (and is nowhere to be found)? Who will take his subjects to him, so that they can inform him about their problems? Who will force them to obey him, so that they adhere to his commands? If some of his representative feigned obedience to him, so that he can give him some appointment and after that he took what he wanted from the state treasury, fled and live in some cities under some kings; what can the infallible do about that?

Therefore, by this thesis it is known that the necessary goals or benefits cannot be attained through one infallible leader even if he possess power and authority. Then, how can that be attained if he is weak, humbled, subjugated and oppressed? Then, how about if he is lost, absent and he cannot be able to talk to anyone? Then, how about if he is none existent; he has no reality; he absolutely does not exist?

Seventhly: We say: Preventing others from committing injustice; taking the rights of the oppressed from the oppressor and conveying rights to those who deserved them; all are branches of preventing

injustice and giving people their rights. So, if the infallible leader is weak, subjugated and oppressed to the extent that he cannot be able to protect himself from injustice; he cannot be able to take back his right to rule, he cannot be able to take back his wealth and he cannot be able to take back the right of his wife over her inheritance. Then, what kinds of injustice can he be able to prevent? And which rights can he be able to convey (to those who deserved them)? How about the one that does not exist or he is full of fear of being killed by the oppressors, to the extent that he cannot be able to appear in a village or in a city; and he is always and continuously in that condition for more than one thousand, one hundred years? The land is full of injustice, evil and corruption and he cannot be able to identify (or introduce) himself; Then how can such a person prevent injustice from people or convey rights to its owners? The characteristics of Shia Rafidah are well suited to the words of Allah the Most High: **“Or do you think that most of them hear or understand? They are only like cattle; nay, they are even farther astray from the Path. (i.e. even worse than cattle)” (25:44).**

Eighthly: We say: The need for man to take care of his body is greater than the need of a city for its governor. Thus, if Allah the Most Exalted did not create the human soul infallible; then how can it be compulsory upon him to create an infallible leader? A man can disbelieve in his heart, he can disobey Allah in his heart; he can possess many things of injustice and evil and the infallible cannot be able to detect them or know them and even if he knew them, he cannot be able to remove them. If this is not obligatory, how can that be obligatory?

Ninthly: We say: Is the requirement and need for leaders by man to obtain benefits more than evil and that if man has them he will be closer to goodness than corruption in such a manner that if they do not exist that cannot be attained? Or is the purpose of their existence is to bring about absolute goodness that is devoid of evil? Or it will bring about just a measure of goodness? If the first option is true, then this goal has been achieved through most leaders. Undoubtedly, this goal has been achieved during the Caliphates

Abubakar, Umar and Uthman in a greater measure that it was achieved during the caliphate of Ali and the goal was also achieved through the Umayyad Caliphs and the Abbasid Caliphs more than what is obtained through the twelve Imams. This is also achieved through the Kings of Rome, Turks and India, more than is obtained through the awaited Imam, who they call the Prince of the time (Sahib az-Zaman); for surely no leader that rule and his none existence is known and he does not possess a representative, except that the evil that will occur due to his none existence is greater than the evil that will occur if he exist, but it may be that the benefits are attained from other than him are greater than those obtained from him. There is a maxim which stated: "Sixty years with an oppressive, unjust leader is better than one night without a leader."

If it said: Nay, there purpose is to bring about absolute goodness that is devoid of evil! We reply that: This has not occurred; Allah has not created that and He did not create means that made that obligatory without any excuse and whoever made that compulsory has made its exigencies imperative upon Allah. In such a situation, he is either being arrogant to his intellect or he is blaming his Lord. Creating what will make that exist, cannot make that to occur, if the means of doing that are not created. This type of statement can be made concerning human action, but its intensity is greater concerning the infallible; because his benefits are hinged upon means that are beyond his ability, nay beyond the ability of Allah – according to Shia Rafidah, who are Mu'atazilites/Rafidah. Therefore making that (creating infallible leaders) compulsory upon Allah is more false than making it compulsory upon Him to create benefits for each of His slaves.

Tenthly: with regard to the words of the Rafidi: "(The leader) shall be infallible, otherwise he will need another leader because what caused the necessity of an infallible leader is the possibility of the community to fall into mistake. Thus, if he can also commit mistake, he will need another leader and if that one is infallible, he will naturally be the leader otherwise a vicious circle will persist."

We reply that: Why is it not permissible that if a leader commits mistake, there will be some people in the community who will call his attention, in such a way that the whole community cannot agree on falsehood or mistake. And if some part of the community make mistake, the leader or his representative or someone else will call their attention and if the Imam commit mistake, his attention will be called by his representative or deputy or someone else and thereby infallibility will be established for the whole community and not to only one individual – as has been stated by Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah? This is similar to those who transmitted a concurrent hadith, for each of them (as individuals) might commit mistake, may be one of them might lie intentionally, but the whole as a group cannot customarily tell lies. The same thing will be said about a group of people who are sighting a new moon or doing other delicate things; one of them might make mistake, but a large number of people cannot make mistake. The same thing can be said about those who are studying mathematics and engineering; one of them might make mistake on one or two issues, but if a large number of learned scholars on those subjects put their heads together; customarily they will not make mistake.

It is well known that establishment of infallibility upon a people who have had a consensus on a matter is more rational and possible than its establishment on one person. If infallibility is untenable upon a large number of people when they agreed upon a particular issue, then its being untenable concerning an individual is more acceptable. And if it is possible for an individual to be infallible; then its possibility upon him and those similar to him, in a group is better and more deserved. Therefore, establishing infallibility to a group is foremost than establishing it for an individual. With the group infallibility the desired goal for the attainment of infallibility of a leader will be achieved.

It is part of the ignorance of Shia Rafidah that they are they obligating the infallibility of one person among the Muslims and they are saying that all the Muslims can fall into error, if there isn't in existence among them one infallible. But sound, clear intellect bear

witness to the fact that, if many scholars – with their different Ijtihads – agreed upon a statement (opinion), that will be found to be more correct than the opinion of an individual and that if knowledge with a lone hadith can be attained, then acquiring it with a concurrent, successive hadith is better and foremost. What will explain this contention further, is that a leader is an associate of people in general well-being; he cannot provide it (all their needs) alone except if he involve people in it; he cannot be able to execute legal sanctions, he cannot be able to discharge all rights, he cannot be able to fight an enemy except if they aid him. Nay, he cannot be able to either lead them in Friday prayers or the five daily prayers except if they pray behind him and it is not possible for them to carry out what he command them to do except with their will and strength. Therefore, since he is their partner in will and action, he cannot exclude them and act alone. Likewise, he cannot be the only one who possesses knowledge and opinion; nay they are partners in them, they aid him and he aids them. In the like manner that his abilities will fail without their aid, so also his knowledge will fail without their aid.

Eleventh: The religious sciences that is required by leaders and the Islamic community are two types: General sciences, such as the obligation of the five daily prayers, fasting, Zakat, pilgrimage, outlawing of illegal sexual intercourse, prohibition of stealing and drinking wine etc.; and science of the branches of religion, such as the obligation upon a specific person or the obligation of executing punishment upon a particular person etc.

The general sciences are limited to the Shari'ah (Islamic law) and it does not need a leader. Undoubtedly, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has explained the necessary Islamic laws or he has left of it what requires analogy: If the first is what is required; then the goal has been achieved and if the second is required, then that measure can be attained through analogy. If it is claimed that the Prophet (s.a.w) has left of religious sciences what cannot be known through neither texts nor by analogy, nay it can only be known by the statement of the infallible. This entailed that that infallible is an associate in

Prophethood and not a deputy. Undoubtedly, if he can make things obligatory and forbid some things without referring to the texts of the Prophet (s.a.w); that means he is independent of him and not his follower; and such person cannot be but a prophet. The person who is a deputy of the Prophet or his successor cannot be independent of him (and his teachings). Again, if analogy is a proof; it is allowed to refer people to it and if it is not a proof; it is incumbent upon the Prophet (s.a.w) to inform his community all the general sciences. Again, Allah the Most High has said: **“...This day, I have perfected your religion for you, completed My Favor upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion...” (5:3).** This is a text maintaining that the religion of Islam is completed and it is perfect and that it does not require any other thing. With regard to science of the branches of the laws: It is not possible to single out each of them with mention by texts and thus, Ijtihad that is called achieving the assigned (طتحقيق المنا) □□ is necessary in order to determine it. It is not possible for the law giver to inform each individual the direction of prayer by text or to inform each judge about the reliability of each witness that stood before him by texts and other similar cases. On this basis, they are only displaying arrogance, if they claimed that the leader is infallible with regard to science of the branches, and nobody is making such claims. Undoubtedly Ali used to appoint a person to position of authority or to discharge some duties and later on he will find that he has betrayed the trust given to him or he is weak (unable to discharge it) and other similar defects and lapses. He (Ali) once cut up the hand of a thief on the basis of witnesses given to him by two men and later on the two men said to him they have made mistake (in their testifying that the man is a thief). He said to them: “If I knew that you told lies deliberately, I will have cut up your hands.” It comes in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) used to say: ***“You people are bringing your cases to be for determining and vetting , one of you may express his plea more than the other, so I give judgment on their behalf according to what I hear from them. (Bear in mind in my judgment) if I slice off anything from the right of his brother, he shall not accept***

***that, for I sliced off for him a portion from the Hell-Fire.”
(Bukhari, Muslim).***

Twelfth: We say: With regard to the infallibility that is established for the Imam (leader): Is it his obedience to Allah by his choice and abandoning disobedience to Allah by his choice – this although according to your beliefs, Allah do not create his choice? Or is it ability created for him? Or is it that he has been dispossessed of the ability to commit any act of disobedience? If you accept the first option; although your belief is that Allah do not create the choice of actors (those who commit an act); then it is binding upon you that Allah cannot be able to create an infallible. If you accept the second option: Your main belief on Allah’s ability has been nullified. And if you accepts the third option: You have dispossessed him of the ability to commit disobedience and therefore, an infallible to you is a person who is weak and unable to commit a sin, in the same manner that a blind man cannot be able to place dots (to punctuate, provide diacritical points to letters) on letters of the Qur’an and the crippled cannot be able to walk. Whoever cannot be able to carry out a duty, cannot be commanded to do it or to avoid it and if he is not commanded to do it, he does not deserve recompense for obedience (to Allah) and therefore, your infallible cannot receive recompense for avoiding committing sin and neither for his acts of obedience and this is an utmost defect. In this case any individual Muslim is better than the infallible Imam if he cannot be able to commit a sin and then repent (to Allah); for through repentance his sins are forgiven, nay each sin will be replaced with a good righteous deed, in addition to his past righteous deeds. Therefore, the recompense of those discharging religious duties are better than the infallible of the Shia. This has contradicted their beliefs to the utmost degree.

With regard to your second premise: If it is ordained that the existence of an infallible leader is necessary; your statement that nobody is an infallible except Ali by consensus of all Muslims is rejected. Nay, many people among the ascetics, the mystics, the Sufis, the army and the masses believe that many of their Sheikhs (and leaders) are infallible, in the same manner that the Shia Rafidah

believe that the twelve leaders are infallible. They may express that by saying: "The Sheikh is protected." Since they are having this belief regarding their Sheikhs, although they believe that Prophet's companions are better than them; then for them to believe that Caliphs among the companions are infallible is foremost. A lot of people have extreme views with regard to their Sheikhs (and leaders) in a similar manner that the Shia Rafidah has extreme beliefs with regard to their leaders. Shia Isma'iliyyah also believes in the infallibility of their Imams, who are men different from the twelve Imams of the Rafidah. In addition to that many of the supporters of Bani Umayyah – or most of them – used to believe that a leader will not be judged in the Hereafter and he will not be punished in the Hereafter and that Allah will not judge them regarding their obedience to their leaders (in any matter and whether right or wrong). Nay, it is obligatory upon them to obey their leaders in all matters and that it is Allah who commanded them to do so. Their statement on this matter is well known to everybody. When Yazid bin Abdulmalik was appointed as Caliph, he decided to follow the conduct and footsteps of Umar bin Abdulaziz, but a group of their Sheikhs went to him and they swore before him by Allah Who has no partner, that if Allah gives power and authority to a person upon a people; He will accept from him all good deeds and forgive him all evil deeds. That is why you find most of their elders stating that an absolute obedience to a leader (with authority) is obligatory, and that whoever obeys him has obeyed Allah and that is why a similitude was coined for them: "Syrian obedience."

Thus, those people are saying that their leaders are not commanding them but with the command of Allah (whatever they command them is the command of Allah) and there isn't any Shia among them. Nay, many among them hate Ali and curse him. Whoever believes that whatever his leader commands is what Allah has commanded, that Allah will recompense him for that obedience and that He will punish him for abandoning it; he will not need an infallible Iman other than his Iman.

Therefore, the answers are from two perspectives. The first of it is that; if all those groups are asked: Is it necessary that you have an infallible leader? They will reply saying: The infallible leader I am following is enough for me, and therefore, I do not need the infallibility of the twelve Imams; neither Ali, nor other than him. This one will say: My Sheikh is my example and that one will say: My leader is the Umayyad and the adherent of Shia Isma'iliyyah will say the same thing regarding his leaders. Nay, there are many people who believe that whoever obey any King has commit no sin and they give interpretation (that suite them) to the words of Allah the Most High: **“O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad), and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority. (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), if you believe in Allah and in the Last Day. That is better and more suitable for final determination” (4:59).** If it is argued that: The beliefs and opinions of those people cannot be considered. It will be replied that: Those people are better than Shia Rafidah and Isma'iliyyah. In addition to that, the leaders of those people and their Sheikhs are better than none existent (awaited Mahdi), for no benefit can be obtained from him and from all considerations they are better than Rafidah.

We also say that: The plea of Rafidah has been nullified by their statement: Infallibility has not been claimed for anybody other than Ali and his progeny. If they say: There isn't anybody from among the companions who claimed infallibility for Abubakar, Umar and Uthman. We reply that: If nobody among them has claimed infallibility for Ali your statement has become null, and if there is anybody among them that claimed infallibility for him; that will not prevent that there are among them who claimed infallibility for the three Caliphs. Nay, claim of infallibility for those three is foremost, because we certainly knew that the generality of the companions gave preference and precedence to Abubakar and Umar. Nay, Ali used to give them preference and precedence over himself, as has been concurrently reported from him. Therefore, their claims that those two are infallible is foremost than the claimed infallibility for Ali.

If it is said that: This has not been transmitted from them. We reply that: Likewise, nobody has transmitted from them that Ali is infallible. We do not affirm or confirm (or believe) infallibility of this person or that person, but we saying: It is impossible to negate the statement of somebody among them on the infallibility of the three, if we consider the Shia claim that they have been saying that Ali is infallible. Nobody can be able to claim this difference and nobody can be able to transmit such a claim from any person among them. Therefore, we do not know the time when infallibility has been claimed for Ali or any of the twelve Imams and nobody at that time is claiming infallibility for anyone else. Thus, it is false to make argument with negation of infallibility to the three (Caliphs) and the occurrence of disagreement on the infallibility of Ali.

Thirteenth: We say: It is either necessary for an infallible to exist at all times or it is not necessary. If it is not necessary; their belief have been negated and if it is necessary; we do not accept that Ali is the only infallible to the exclusion of the three. Nay, if this statement is true, then it entailed that Abubakar, Umar and Uthman are infallibles. This is because Ahlus Sunnah have agreed upon preferring Abubakar and Umar and therefore, they deserved more to be infallibles than Ali. Thus if it is possible for anybody to be infallible; then they more deserved it and if it is impossible; then it the farthest away from him (Ali).

Nobody among the Ahlus Sunnah is saying that Ali is infallible to the exclusion of Abubakar and Umar and they do not accept the negation of infallibility from the three except if it is negated from Ali. Thus, negating it from the three to the exclusion of Ali is not the statement of anybody among the Ahlus Sunnah.

If it is said: You people believe in the negation of infallibility from the three. We reply that: We believe in negating infallibility from Ali and we believe that negating it from him is foremost than negating it from other than him and they more deserved to be infallible than him, if it is possible and tenable. Thus, with all these, nobody can argue with us with our statement. And again, we accept negation of infallibility from the three, because we believe that Allah has not created an

infallible leader and if it happens that He has created an infallible leader; then certainly they deserved more to be infallible than all those who come after them; but we negated that they are infallibles for we believe that Allah has not created an infallible man.

There is a third rejoinder to the basis of those premises, which is that: How do you know that Ali is infallible to the exclusion of all other people? If they say: By the consensus (of the companions or scholars or Muslims) that Ali is infallible and the negation of infallibility to all other than him as they have mentioned in their second premise. It will be said to them: If consensus is not a proof (evidence),^[152] this plea has been nullified and if it is evidence in maintaining the infallibility of Ali; - which is the basis - then it is also evidence on the infallibility of consensus in protecting the Islamic law and transmitting it. Those people are arguing with consensus to prove their case and at the same time they are rejecting consensus as evidence in law; then how did they know that Ali is infallible to the exclusion of all others? If they claimed that there are concurrent transmitted texts from the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning his infallibility; this is similar to their claim of the existence of concurrent texts with regard to his leadership and thus, they do not have anything to rely on.

The fourth rejoinder: Consensus is not an authority to Shia Rafidah, except if the statement of the infallible has agreed with it and if the infallible cannot be known except with his statement, that entailed the persistence of a vicious circle; for certainly, his infallibility cannot be known except with his statement and we do not know if his statement is true except if we know that he is infallible; one of those views can never be proven. This absolutely showed that those people do not possess a reliable knowledge on what they believe.

If they are asked: With what authority did you know that he is infallible and that other than him are not infallible? They will reply: Because he said: "I am infallible, and nobody other than me is infallible!" This type of statement can be made by anybody and thus, it cannot be an authority. If it is established that the existence of an infallible leader is necessary, then the next action is to identify him. If

a Shia Isma'ili is asked, to specify his infallible Imam and what are his reasons for saying that that particular person is his infallible leader to the exclusion of all other people. He will absolutely not be able to advance any proof and his words will be self contradictory. The Shia Rafida took from the Qadriyyah their concept of considering the best; they said it is obligatory upon Allah to consider the best for His slaves (حجوب رعاية الأصل) □ and they built upon it the necessity of an infallible leader; all those are false statements. If he is asked to specify the infallible leader he will absolutely not be able to advance any proof except the statement of a person who is not yet confirmed as infallible saying: "I am infallible." If they contended that: If the intellectual necessity for the existence of an infallible leader has been proven and Ali said: "I am infallible." This showed that he is infallible, because he is the person who made that claim. They will be replied that: If we assume that the existence of an infallible has been proven; then the mere saying of someone that: "I am infallible," is not acceptable, for it is possible other than him is the infallible even though we are not aware of his claim and if he did not openly declare his claim. Nay – according to Shia – it is permissible for him not to declare his claim to infallibility, in the like manner that it is permissible for the awaited Imam to disappear out of fear of the oppressors. After all that we have stated, if it happens that Ali has made claim to infallibility, his words will be accepted, if it has been reliably confirmed that he has made such claim. Allah forbids that he made such claim and far be it from him claiming infallibility.^[153]

The fifth rejoinder: If there isn't any evidence on infallibility except a statement from Ali saying: "I am surely infallible," we will accept the words of Ali on this issue; but it is not possible for any person to transmit such a claim from him with a sound reliable chain of authority. Nay, what has been concurrently transmitted from him repudiated infallibility from his person.

The sixth rejoinder: Surely confirming his judges to give verdict and judgments contrary to his views and opinions, is a strong proof that he did not consider himself as infallible. It come in sound hadiths that Ali said: "My opinion and that of Umar agreed upon that slave

women who gave birth to children shall not be sold, but now my opinion is that they can be sold.” His judge Ubaidullah as-Salmani said to him: “Your opinion with that of Umar in unity is more beloved to me than your opinion alone in dissention” (Sunan Baihaqi). His judge, Shuraih, used to judge and give verdicts based on his Ijtihad and he neither consult Ali nor refer to him and Ali used to confirm him on what he is doing. Ali used to give judgments and religious verdict and thereafter review and abandon his Ijtihad, in the like manner of the other companions. Statements of Ali on this issue are transmitted with sound chains of authority and they can be found in the books of hadith (and jurisprudence).

*** Ali used to say: “Pass judgments as you used to do, for surely, I hate disagreement and so that people will be in unity or I die the way my companions died.” His subjects used to disagree with him, but he will disagree with them and later on he will realize that their opinion is the correct one. His son Hassan advised him not to leave Madina, and not to remove Mu’awiyah. Nobody who is sane and rational will doubt that politics and administration were orderly and smooth to Abubakar and Umar in contrast to Ali.

SEGMENT: CRITIQUE OF SHIA TEXTUAL ARGUMENTS ON ALI'S LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: "The second principle: It is incumbent and necessary that a leader shall be appointed by text (Qur'an and Sunnah), due to what we have mentioned of the falsity of selection, because some of those who are selected from the community are not foremost and above others that have been selected. And because selection leads to disagreement and fighting and thus, appointing a leader through selection leads to greater types of evil and corruption. Therefore, in order to avoid the least evil and corruption that can result from selecting a leader, we made his appointment by text obligatory and it is known that, with the exception of Ali – among all their leaders – none of them has been appointed through text by consensus (of all Muslims) and thus, it is clear that he is the leader."

We reply that: Firstly: Our response to the above statement is total rejection of the two advanced premises, although disagreement on the second premise is clearer and more apparent. This is because many groups among the predecessors and those who come after them, among the scholars of hadith, jurisprudence, and scholastic theologians believe in the textual appointment of Abubakar and a group of Shia Rafidah believed in the textual appointment of Abbas.

Secondly: And therefore his words: "With the exception of Ali – among all their leaders – none of them have been appointed through text by consensus (of all Muslims)," is a definite, clear lie, because there is no consensus on negating texts in favor of other than Ali. This Rafidi, although he is among the best scholars among the Shia and the most prominent in his sect; there is no doubt that all members of his denomination are ignorant people. If that is not the case; whoever is conversant with the opinions of Muslims scholars; how can he make claim to this type of consensus?

Thirdly: This is a compound answer and we are saying: It is one of two options: Either we accept that there are texts on leadership (who will become the successor of the Prophet after him) or we reject

them; if it is considered and accepted, we reject the second premise. If we assert that: The appointment of Abubakar is proven by texts and if that is not considered, the first premise has been nullified.

Fourthly: We say: consensus in your creed is neither evidence nor an authority, and the authority to you is the words of the infallible leader and therefore, the responsibility of proving the text is on the person you are claiming his infallibility and up to now he did not prove either textual appointment or infallibility. Nay, a person can object saying: We do not know the soundness of his words: "I am the infallible, I am the textually appointed leader," as a proof. This is an extreme ignorance. This argument is similar to the one mentioned before it.

Fifthly: What do you mean by your words: "It is incumbent and necessary that a leader shall be appointed by text?" This is because he (the Prophet) must say: "This is your leader (after me), therefore, listen to him and obey him;" and he will be his successor by mere mentioning those words or he will not be the leader despite that until he is appointed by people and given the vow of allegiance! If you accepted the first option, we say: We do not accept obligation of a text on this consideration and Shia Zaidiyyah are with the Ahlus Sunnah wal-Jama'ah in rejecting that text and they are among the Shia who cannot be accused of being against Ali.

With regard to his words: "If a leader is not appointed by text that will lead to disagreement and fighting." We reply that: Text that will show that he deserved to be the Caliph, which evidence will be known by assessment and deductions in order to attain what is required in law; not all laws are clearly and explicitly explained by texts in such a manner that everybody understood the same way. Thus, if these texts are sufficient on general issues that are obligatory to be known at all times and places; then there sufficiency on issues related to branches of religion, which is appointing a particular leader, is foremost and more appropriate. We have already mentioned that it is possible for the Prophet (s.a.w) to make a textual expression of general laws, in contrast to branches of the laws. Again, if the evidence showed that some people more deserved to be leaders

than him; that is a sufficient proof on not appointing him. The evidences that showed Abubakar more deserved to be the leader are very clear and self-evident to the extent that nobody disputed them against him among the companions. Those who disputed the Caliphate among the Ansar did not dispute that Abubakar is the best among the Muhajirun, he just requested that one person shall be appointed from the Muhajirun and one person from the Ansar.

If it is contended that: If they followed their vain desires they can stop them as indicated by texts. We reply that: If they followed their vain desires, disobeyed the texts and shunned them; - as you have claimed – with their desire to follow the truth the goal will be achieved by this and that and with their disobedience this and that will not benefit.

Sixthly: We say: Textual provisions of the laws are two types: General laws that encompass its specific and texts that deal with branches of the law. Thus, if you say that it is obligatory to appoint a leader by text: If you mean by that the general texts i.e. conditions upon a leader, his duties and responsibilities, duties of his subject towards him, such as texts on judges and those who give religious verdict, witnesses, those who lead prayers, those who call to prayers, leaders of armies of Jihad and other people that are appointed to shoulder some responsibilities (in an Islamic community) – there are a lot of texts on these issues – thanks be to Allah – in the like manner they exist in all Islamic precepts.

Seventhly: We say: You people have made textual appointment of a leader compulsory (upon Allah), so that selection cannot lead to disagreement and fighting and greater evil and corruption and so that even the least measure of it can be avoided. We reply that: The reality is contrary to your contention because Abubakar has been selected and nothing of this evil and corruption has occurred and Umar and Uthman have also been Caliphs and nothing of that evil and corruption has occurred. Nay, that evil and corruption occurred in a great measure when the leader you claimed is textually appointed becomes the Caliph to the exclusion of all others. During his Caliphate, many types of fighting and evils occurred and it is for

the avoidance of the occurrence of its least measure that you obligated textual appointment of the leader (upon Allah). What you have made a means to achieve some goals (peace, benefits and goodness) has turn out to be opposite of the desired target and the aim has been achieved (in the past) without your means. Therefore, what you have mentioned as a means of achieving a goal has been nullified. This is because they made obligatory upon Allah what is not obligatory to Him and they foretold what does not exist. It is due to their lies and ignorance that this contradictions persist.

Eighthly: We say: The texts that will remove that evil and corruption will be from many angles:

The first angle: That the Prophet (s.a.w) predicted the Caliphate of a person and praised his great work and outstanding achievements during his Caliphate. That is when the Islamic community will know that if that person becomes the Caliph; his administration will be acceptable and praiseworthy. Through this acts disagreement will not occur, even if he did not say: Appoint so and so. This type of text has occurred on the rights of Abubakar and Umar. In a sound hadith it was narrated by Abu Huraira: Allah's Apostle said, ***"While I was sleeping, I saw myself standing at a well over which there was a bucket. I pulled out from it as many buckets of water as Allah wished, and then Ibn Abi Quhafa (Abu Bakr) took the bucket from me and pulled out one or two full buckets, and there was weakness in his pull--may Allah forgive him. Then the bucket turned into a very large one and 'Umar bin Al-Khattab took it. I have never seen any strong man among the people, drawing water with such strength as 'Umar did, till the people (drank to their satisfaction and) watered their camels to their fill; whereupon the camels sat beside the water" (Bukhari).***

Second angle: That he predicted things that will show the soundness of the Caliphate (of the person). Those things have happened during the Caliphate of Abubakar and Umar.^[154]

Third angle: That he commanded the person who he asked to return to him, that if he return and did not find him (find that he has died), he shall go and meet his successor; the person who is leading the

community. Thus, showing that that person will be his successor. This has occurred to Abubakar.

The fourth angle: That he wanted to write a document on who will succeed him and then he will abandon the idea and say: Surely Allah and the believers will not agree on anyone except a named person. This has happened to Abubakar.

The fifth angle: He commanded following the footsteps of a person and that person become the Caliph after him. [\[155\]](#)

The sixth angle: That he command following the footsteps of the righteous, well guided and guiding Caliphs that will come after him and he restricted their period to a particular time and specific years and that will show that those who ruled during that period; they are the well guided and guiding Caliphs. In a sound hadith the Prophet said: ***“Stick to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the Rightly Guided Caliphs after me. He continued: Hold on to that with your molar teeth”*** (Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud). [\[156\]](#)

The seventh angle: That he specifically designates a particular person with some commands and responsibilities, which will show that he preferred him to succeed him. This too has occurred to Abubakar.

It comes in sound hadiths that the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Aisha: ***“Call for me your farther and your brother, so that I will write for Abubakar a statement.’ Then he said: ‘Allah and the believers will not agree but on Abubakar.’ In another version is added the phrase: ‘So that nobody will covet this affair’”*** (Bukhari, Muslim). Thus, it is known that Allah will not allow anybody to be the Caliph other than Abubakar and that the believers will not give vow of allegiance to anybody other than Abubakar. There are a lot of sound hadiths which showed that the Prophet (s.a.w) knew it and although he knew it he did not mentioned the matter and that is better. This is because if the Islamic community choose him by their choice; without any compulsion – and that is what Allah and His Messenger are pleased with – it is better for them; and it showed the knowledge and religious adherence of the Islamic community.

SEGMENT: CRITIQUE OF SHIA RAFIDI CLAIM THAT LEADERSHIP OF ALI IS TO PROTECT THE ISLAMIC LAW

The Rafidi stated: "The third principle: It is obligatory upon the leader to be a preserver and protector of the Islamic laws due to the stoppage of revelation by the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). And because the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Prophet are defective in providing detailed laws regarding branches of religion and the issues that will be occurring (be coming up) to the Last Day. Therefore, it is imperative to have a leader (Imam) who is appointed by Allah and who is infallible from committing errors and mistakes, so that some laws cannot be abandoned or be increased intentionally or due to some mistake; and other than Ali did not possess those qualities by consensus."

We reply that: The replies are from many perspectives:

The first perspective: We do not accept that it is incumbent upon a leader to protect and preserve the Islamic law. Nay, it is compulsory upon the Islamic community (all Muslims) to protect the Islamic laws. Protecting and preserving the Islamic law can be achieved through (the collective effort of) the Islamic community, in the like manner that it can be achieved through the efforts of an individual. Nay, if the scholars concurrently transmit the Islamic law that is better than its being transmitted by an individual. If each group of scholars transmits part of the Islamic law, the objective (of its being preserved) will be achieved and the infallibility that is attained through concurrent transmitters is greater in the estimation of all human beings than the person who is not a prophet. Surely, if it is said that Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali are infallibles; even then, what the Muhajirun and the Ansar transmitted is more intense and greater in the estimation of human beings than what they have transmitted. And again, if a lot of people are criticizing (and not accepting) the infallibility of the transmitter, the desired goal cannot be achieved. Then how about if many people in the Islamic community are ascribing him to apostasy and unbelief? Concurrent

transmission of the law can be achieved through many reporters even if their reliability is not verified.

Second perspective: We say: do you mean by your statement; a person that will preserve the Islamic law even if he is not infallible? Or upon a person who is infallible? If you hinged your statement upon infallibility, this is your first principle and you are merely repeating it here. We have already given reply to it. If you are hinging your statement upon mere preservation without infallibility; then we do not accept that Ali preserves the Book and Sunnah more than the other companions, or that he knew the Book and the Sunnah more than Abubakar and Umar. Nay, they knew the Book and Sunnah more than him. With this, his claim to consensus is nullified and negated.

The third perspective: We say: Do you mean by his being the preserver of the Islamic law that the soundness of any part of the Islamic law cannot be known except if he is the one who transmitted it? Or the soundness of some of it can be known through other transmitters (without his transmitting it)? If you accepted the second option; then he is not needed neither in preserving the law nor is it required that he is infallible, for if it is possible to preserve some parts of the Islamic law without him (by other people); then it is also possible to preserve the other parts, to the extent that all the Islamic law can be preserved without need for him. If you say: Nay, what we mean is that nothing of the Islamic law can be known except through his preservation. We say: In such a situation, the evidence and plea cannot be proven upon all human beings except through his transmission; the soundness of what he has transmitted cannot be known, until it is verified that he is infallible; his being infallible cannot be known until there is consensus on negating infallibility on other than him. Thus, if consensus of the Islamic community is infallible; the Islamic law can be preserved through it and if consensus is not infallible; his being infallible cannot be known (is not verifiable).

Fourth perspective: We say: Why is it not possible that each group (of scholars) is infallible in what it preserved and transmitted in accordance to what it specialized of the Islamic law? Thus, the

reciters of the Qur'an are infallible in preserving the Qur'an and transmitting it, the scholars of hadith are infallible in preserving the hadith and transmitting it and the jurists are infallible in understanding the texts and deducing the laws. This is the known fact and reality by which Allah suffices the Islamic community from the affairs of the none existent (the so called hidden Shia Mahdi).

Fifth perspective: If the Islamic law cannot be preserved and transmitted except by one person after one person; an infallible after an infallible; and this awaited infallible leader has spent more than four hundred and sixty years (now more than one thousand one hundred and twenty four years) and nobody receive from him any Islamic law. Then from where did you learn the Qur'an in the last more than one thousand and one hundred years? Isn't it possible that the Qur'an you are reading now is devoid of the words of Allah? Again, where did you acquire knowledge of the history of the Prophet (s.a.w) and some of his laws, while you did not hear anything from that infallible; because the infallible is either lost without a trace or none existent? If they say: We acquire that through concurrent reports through our companions, who transmitted them from infallible Imam. We say to them: If concurrent report from your companions that are transmitted from infallible leaders are enough to preserve the laws and transmit them! Then why is it that the concurrent reports of all the Islamic community from its Prophet (s.a.w), cannot be considered as being the foremost and the more deserved method of preserving it and transmitting it, in contrast to its being transmitted from one person by another one person?

Sixth perspective: We say: with regard to your statement: "Due to stoppage of revelation by the death of the Prophet. And because the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of the Prophet (s.a.w) are defective in providing detailed laws..." We ask you: Do you mean it is defective in the explanation of a branch to a particular, specific branch? Or Its defectiveness on general explanations that encompasses all branches of the law? If you claimed the first option it will be said to you: All statements of a leader and the statements of everybody are on this status. If a leader delivered a speech to people, he must

speak to them on general issues encompassing specific matters, actions etc.; it will certainly be impossible for him to mention in his speech each action that will be carried out by each individual at all times. Therefore, if he can only be able to make a general all-encompassing speech; then know that the Prophet (s.a.w) can make general all-encompassing speech. If you claimed that texts of the Prophet are not general and all encompassing; it will be said to you: That is impossible. If we assumed denying that from the Prophet (s.a.w) who is more perfect than a leader (Imam); then denying that from texts of the Imams are foremost and more deserved. You are forced to two options while assessing the speech of the Imam: Either affirming general statements or affirming considered general meaning. Whatever is possibly affirmed with regard to the speech of the Prophet (s.a.w), does not require an (infallible) Imam to explain its laws.

Seventh perspective: We say: Allah the Most High has said: **“And We sent not a Messenger except with the language of his people, in order that he might make (the Message) clear for them...” (14:4).** He the Most Exalted also said: **“Messengers as bearers of good news as well as of warning in order that mankind should have no plea against Allah after the Messengers. And Allah is Ever AllPowerful, AllWise” (4:165).** And Allah said: **“...The Messenger's duty is only to convey (the message) in a clear way (i.e. to preach in a plain way)” (24:54).** Thus, we ask: Has proof been established for all people by the explanations of the Prophet (s.a.w) or not? If it has not been established, these verses are nullified, so also all other verses that give the same meaning. If the proofs have been established by the explanations of the Prophet (s.a.w), then it is known that another explanation of a specific person, whose explanations are required by the people is not needed let alone preserving its transmission. Surely, what Allah has created in man of the ability to transmit the words of the Prophet (s.a.w) and to explain it, is enough (from requiring an infallible Imam); especially since Allah has guaranteed protecting what has been revealed of the Remembrance (the

Qur'an) and thus it has been protected and preserved from change, substitution and interpolation. Allah the Most High said: **“Verily We: It is We Who have sent down the Dhikr (i.e. the Quran) and surely, We will guard it (from corruption)” (15:9).**

Summarily, the claim of those who have been abandoned by Allah, that the religion of Allah cannot be preserved or understood except with one particular person is the greatest corruption of the principle of religion, and this cannot be said - by anybody who knew its exigencies – except an atheist, unbeliever whose aim is to destroy the religion of Islam and nobody can propagate it (such beliefs) except the person who has reached extreme stage in ignorance and misguidance.

Eighth perspective: We say: It is known out of necessity that most of the Muslims acquired the knowledge of the Qur'an and Sunnah without Ali's transmittance. When Umar conquered countries, he sent to Iraq and Syria scholars from among the Prophet's companions who taught them Islam and jurisprudence and it is from them that knowledge was transmitted to all the Muslims. What Ali transmitted and taught the Muslims is not greater than what has been transmitted and taught by Abdullah bin Mas'ud and Mu'az bin Jabal and those similar to them.

This is a well-known fact: If the Islamic religion has not been preserved except with transmission through Ali, then most of the religion will be lost, because it is impossible to transmit from him except a little knowledge with which the goal cannot be achieved; (most of) what has been transmitted from him is not concurrent and at our time there isn't any infallible person that can be referred to. There is no power no strength serve with Allah! How foolish is the brain of the Shia Rafidah?

SEGMENT: NEGATING RAFIDA'S CLAIM ON THE OBLIGATION OF APPOINTING AN INFALLIBLE IMAM

The Rafidi stated: "The fourth principle: Surely Allah can be able to appoint an infallible leader, the world need him and there is no evil in appointing him. Therefore, it is compulsory to appoint him and other than Ali is not infallible by consensus. And thus, the leader as identified is Ali. Allah's ability is very clear, the need for an infallible leader is also very clear due to what we have explained of occurrence of dispute among people. With regard to lack of evil in appointing him; that also is very clear, because evil is attached and hinged upon lack of appointing him. With regard to the obligation for appointing an infallible Imam; this due to the established Allah's ability, the need for him and lack of evil by appointing him; it is incumbent to do so."

We reply that: This is the first principle that he mentioned and replies to it has already been made by rejecting the first premise and especially the falsity of this argumentation. We said that if he is basing his argumentation on consensus; then if consensus is infallible, it suffices the infallibility of Ali and if it (consensus) is not infallible, advancing it to prove Ali's infallibility is null. Therefore, the argument has been negated by the two appraisals.

It is surprising that the Shia Rafidah are proving their principle of religion on what they are claiming of texts and consensus, while they are the farthest people from having the knowledge of texts and consensus in the Islamic community and arguing with them. In contrast to Ahlus Sunnah Wal-Jama'ah, for Sunnah encompasses texts and Jama'ah (community) encompasses consensus and therefore, Ahlus Sunnah and Jama'ah are the people who follow texts and consensus.

We talk about this stipulation and explain its falsity from many perspectives:

First perspective: We say: We do not accept that there is need to appoint an infallible leader, this is because the infallibility of the

Islamic community suffices the need for his infallibility. This is among what has been mentioned on the wisdom^[157] of the infallibility of the whole community.

Second perspective: If they mean by the need for infallible leader, that with his existence their condition is more perfect. Undoubtedly their condition with the existence of infallible representatives of the leader is more perfect and their condition with the infallibility of themselves is more perfect. Not everything that people think is more perfect for each one of them is done by Allah and it is not compulsory upon Him to do it. Furthermore, making a person who is not a prophet to possess traits of a Prophet (and be similar to him) can be one of the greatest ambiguities and a censure to a particular trait of the Prophet (s.a.w). Surely, if it is made compulsory to believe in whatever that person said, in the like manner that it is compulsory to believe in whatever the Prophet (s.a.w) said, the peculiarity of Prophethood will not be clear. Surely, Allah the Most High has commanded us to believe in all what the prophets have brought. Therefore, if there is anybody who is equal to them in infallibility; believing in whatever he said will be compulsory and thus, the difference between them will be abrogated.

Third perspective: We say: The infallible that is needed by necessity: Is he able to bring about benefits and remove evils? Or is he unable to do any of those things? The second option is rejected because the weak cannot be able to bring about benefits nor can he able to repel evil for ability is a precondition upon all that. Undoubtedly, infallibility benefits the one who is inviting to goodness, but when a caller to goodness exist and he is weak and unable to invite to goodness, the desired goal will not be achieved.

If it said that: Nay the infallible can (be able to discharge those duties). We reply: Such a person does not exist and if those twelve leaders can do it and they refused to do it; this entailed that they are sinners and not infallibles and if they are unable to do it; that entailed that they are weak and incapable (of discharging those duties). One of those opinions is absolutely established or both of them: Inability and negation of infallibility and if the matter is as stated, we knew out

of necessity the nullity of his arguments about his (infallible leader) existence and necessity cannot be countered by argumentations.

Summarily, there isn't any benefit for the existence of an infallible leader after the Prophet (s.a.w) except that it has occurred without him and there are a lot of corruptions that cannot be remove except with his none existence. Therefore, there submission that: "Needs necessitates his existence," is rejected, and there words: "There is no evil in his existence," is also rejected. Nay the reality is in contrast to their submissions: Evils and corruptions with his existence existed and benefits with his existence are nil. If believing in his existence has caused a lot of evil and corruption; what do you think about his actual existence?

SEGMENT: NEGATING SHIA ARGUMENT THAT ALI IS THE IMAM BECAUSE HE IS THE BEST

The Rafidi stated: "The fifth principle: It is obligatory that the leader shall be the best and superior to his subjects. And Ali is the best and most superior of the people in his period, due to what we will mention; and thus he is the leader, because it will be detestable to place an inferior over the superior both rationally and textually. Allah the Most High said: **'... Is then He, Who gives guidance to the truth, more worthy to be followed, or he who finds not guidance (himself) unless he is guided? Then, what is the matter with you? How judge you?' (10:35).**"

We reply that, answers to the above are from many perspectives:

First perspective: We rejected the second vast premise, for we do not accept that Ali is the best among the people of his time. Nay, the best of this community after its Prophet (s.a.w) is Abubakar, then Umar and that has been transmitted from Ali in sound concurrent traditions. We will later on reply to what they have mentioned and substantiate what we have mentioned.

Second perspective: The generality of our people and others, even though they are saying: It is obligatory to appoint the best as far as possible; but this Rafidi did not mention any proof for this premise. Many scholars have differed with him in it.

With regard to the verse he has mentioned: There is no evidence for him in the verse he quoted, because what has been mentioned in the verse are: **"He Who guide to the truth,"** and **"He who find no guidance unless he is guided."** It is not incumbent that an inferior cannot be guided except if he is guided by a superior, nay he can attain much guidance without learning from a superior person. A man can be more guided that the one who is superior to him (and an inferior can guide a superior).

Furthermore, the One Who absolutely guide to the truth is Allah the Most High and the one who cannot find guidance except if he is guided; is the characteristics of all created beings; he cannot receive guidance until he is guided by Allah. This is what the verse teaches

and that worshipping Allah is foremost than worshipping created beings of Allah. It comes in the context of the verses: **“Say: ‘Is there of your (Allah's so-called) partners one that guides to the truth?’ Say: ‘It is Allah Who guides to the truth. Is then He, Who gives guidance to the truth, more worthy to be followed, or he who finds not guidance (himself) unless he is guided? Then, what is the matter with you? How judge you?’” (10:35).** The verses started by stating: **“Say (O Muhammad SAW): “Who provides for you from the sky and from the earth? Or who owns hearing and sight? And who brings out the living from the dead and brings out the dead from the living? And who disposes the affairs?” They will say: “Allah.” Say: “Will you not then be afraid of Allah's Punishment (for setting up rivals in worship with Allah)?’ Such is Allah, your Lord in truth. So after the truth, what else can there be, save error? How then are you turned away? Thus is the Word of your Lord justified against those who rebel (disobey Allah) that they will not believe (in the Oneness of Allah and in Muhammad SAW as the Messenger of Allah). Say: “Is there of your (Allah's so-called) partners one that originates the creation and then repeats it?” Say: “Allah originates the creation and then He repeats it. Then how are you deluded away (from the truth)?” Say: “Is there of your (Allah's so-called) partners one that guides to the truth?” Say: “It is Allah Who guides to the truth. Is then He, Who gives guidance to the truth, more worthy to be followed, or he who finds not guidance (himself) unless he is guided? Then, what is the matter with you? How judge you?” (10:31-35).**

Yet again, many scholars are saying: Authority of the superior is obligatory, if the authority of the inferior is not more beneficial and there is isn't much evil and corruption in the authority of the superior. These researches are being conducted by those who believe that Ali is better than Abubakar and Umar, such as Shia Zaidiyyah and some Mu'atazilites or those who keep silent on that issue, such as a sect of the Mu'atazilites.

Ahlus Sunnah do not need to reject this premise, for to them Abubakar is the best (and the most superior) of the Islamic community after its Prophet (s.a.w). Our aim here is to explain that although Shia Rafidah has told the truth, they are unable to prove it with a sound proof, because they have denied themselves many sources of knowledge and thus they are unable to explain the truth, to the extent that they cannot be able to prove the belief of Ali to the Kharijites and they cannot be able to prove his leadership to Marwaniyyah and those who fought him because they have submerged themselves in similar matters that those who fought him hold of arguments, and because they do not know what their false statements contained of contradictions and corruption; due to the strength of their ignorance and following of their vain desires without knowledge.

*** The Rafidi stated: Virtues are either spiritual or bodily or external and Ali possessed all of them. Nobody has reached him with regard to the external virtues, which is his kindred relation (noble origin). He married the daughter of the Master of human beings, who was the Chief of the women of the world. Akhtab Khawarizim narrated on the authority of Jabir bin Abdullah: 'When Ali married Fatima, Allah married her to him from above the seven Heavens. The one, who sought her hand in marriage on behalf of Ali, is Angel Gabriel and the witnesses are Angels Mikha'il, Israfil and seventy Angels. It was revealed to the tree of Tuba, 'Spray what you possess of gems and precious stones,' and she did so and the women of paradise picked them.'"

We reply that: External matters that are outside belief and fear of Allah cannot confer any favor or preference of Allah. The Prophet (s.a.w): ***"All mankind is from Adam and Eve, an Arab has no superiority over a non-Arab nor a non-Arab has any superiority over an Arab; also a white has no superiority over a black nor a black has any superiority over white except by piety and good action"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). In a sound hadith, Abu Huraira reported: ***"It was said to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as to who was the most worthy of respect amongst people. He***

said: 'The most God-conscious amongst you.' They said: 'It is not this that we are asking about,' whereupon he said: 'Then he is Yusuf, the Apostle of Allah and the son of Allah's Apostle, Ya'qub, who was also the son of Allah's Apostle, the friend of Allah (Ibrahim).' They said: 'This is not what we are asking you.' He said: 'You mean the tribes of Arabia? Those who are good in pre-Islamic days are good in Islam (after embracing Islam) when they get an understanding of it'" (Muslim). Abraham is the most honored to Allah than Joseph. But, what a difference between their two parents? There is nobody above Joseph in terms of noble kinship relation. If we assume that the father of a person is a Prophet and that of another person is an unbeliever, but they are the same in fear of Allah and obedience to Him in all facets; their grade in Paradise will be the same. But the laws of this world are different and contrast to that of the Hereafter, on issues such as leadership, marriage relationship, nobility and prohibition of receiving charity etc.! Goodness among the nobles are greater than among the lower class of people. Allah said: **"Allah chose Adam, Nuh (Noah), the family of Ibrahim (Abraham) and the family of 'Imran above the 'Alamin (mankind and jinns) (of their times)" (3:33).** He also said: **"And indeed, We sent Nuh (Noah) and Ibrahim (Abraham), and placed in their offspring Prophethood and Scripture, and among them there is he who is guided, but many of them are Fasiqun (rebellious, disobedient to Allah)" (57:26).** He also said: **"He said: "O Nuh (Noah)! Surely, he is not of your family; verily, his work is unrighteous, so ask not of Me that of which you have no knowledge! I admonish you, lest you be one of the ignorant" (11:46).** The Jews who have earned the anger of Allah are children of Prophets! Allah also said: **"O mankind! Be afraid of your Lord (by keeping your duty to Him and avoiding all evil), and fear a Day when no father can avail aught for his son, nor a son avail aught for his father. Verily, the Promise of Allah is true, let not then this (worldly) present life deceive you, nor let the chief deceiver (Satan) deceive you about Allah" (31:33).**

If we state that Arabs are better than non-Arabs – as an instance – we mean that the former group possesses a lot of goodness than the latter. The Prophet in a sound hadith stated that: ***“All mankind is from Adam and Eve and Adam is created from earth. An Arab has no superiority over a non-Arab nor a non-Arab has any superiority over an Arab; also a white has no superiority over a black nor a black has any superiority over white except by piety and good action” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** In another hadith the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“All people are the children of Adam ... “Verily, Allah has removed from you the pride of the time of ignorance with its boasting with parents. People are two men; a pious believer or an unfortunate profligate” (Abu Dawud).***

We do not deny that Ali is in the highest state of perfection, but we are contesting that he is better than the three Caliphs and the more deserved to be the leader over them. What he (the Rafidi) has mentioned has not proved that assumption. On this issue people are following two methodologies: Among them, there are those who are saying that preferring some people over another people in the estimation of Allah cannot be known except by information from the Law Giver (text), because the reality of what is in the heart is only known by Allah and thus, people can only know that by information from the truthful... Some of them are saying that can be known through inference (deduction). And Ahlus Sunnah are saying: If both methodologies are given the right consideration, they will prove that the three Caliphs are more perfect than Ali... There are texts and consensus with regard to the first methodology, and all the Islamic community – except the Shia – have agreed upon the precedence of Abubakar and Umar over Ali. Many texts have been cited in this book to support and prove this fact. It was reported in the hadith of Ibn ‘Umar that the companions used to say during the Prophet’s life: ***“The best of this Ummah (community) after its Prophet is Abubakar, then ‘Umar, then ‘Uthman,” and the Prophet (s.a.w) approved of their saying that” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Successive, concurrent reports from Ali show that he used to say, ***“The best of this Ummah after its Prophet is Abubakar then ‘Umar.”*** And he

(Ali) used to say, ***“No one is brought to me who prefers me over them, but I will whip him with the punishment for telling lies.”***

And On the authority of Abdurrahman bin Ghanam, it was said that the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Abubakar and Umar that: ***“If you two are agreed upon a counsel, I would not oppose you.”***

Some scholars said concerning Uthman: He (Uthman) is more knowledgeable of the Qur'an than Ali, while Ali is more knowledgeable of the Sunnah than Uthman. Uthman is greater than Ali on fighting Jihad with his wealth, while Ali is greater than Uthman in fighting Jihad with his body. Uthman is more abstinent with regard to leadership, while Ali is more ascetic with regard to wealth. The conducts of Uthman are better, and he is older with over twenty three years. The Prophet's companions agreed upon putting him forward over Ali (as the Caliph), and thus, he is the best.

They (Shia) also said: Ali is the best due to kindred relation. We reply that: Hamza is one of the greatest among the foremost Muslims and he is closer to the Prophet (s.a.w) in kindred relation. It was narrated that he is master of the martyrs and thus, he is the best. They said that Uthman has done this and has done that; he appointed his relatives, he was extravagant, and he bestows many gifts. We reply that: His Ijtihad on that is more beneficial (to the Islamic community); certainly, extravagance in spending wealth is lighter in danger and consequences than Ijtihad in fighting Muslims, killing them and spilling their blood. That is why the Caliphate of Uthman was quite, smooth and stable. During his caliphate numerous Jihads were fought, many countries and cities were conquered (many communities embraced Islam), a lot of wealth was acquired; but his Caliphate is not close (in benefits to Islam and Muslims) to the caliphate of those who passed before him. Those who rebelled against Uthman ascribed him to profligacy, while those who rebelled against Ali ascribed him to unbelief and apostasy: There is no good in both of them (the rebellious parties).

SEGMENT: NEGATING ARGUMENT OF THE RAFIDI WITH THE VERSE OF WILAYAH ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The second methodology concerning proofs that are taken from the Qur’an and the evidences that proves the leadership of Ali are many in the Noble Book.

The first evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **“Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer)” (5:55).** They have all agreed upon that it was revealed concerning Ali. Tha’alabi stated with its chain of authority to Abu Dhar, who said: ‘I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) with my two ears, otherwise I will block them and saw him with my two eyes otherwise I will blind them, saying: Ali is the leader of the righteous and slayer of the infidels. Victorious is the one who aided him and forsaken is the one who abandon him.’ I one day prayed mid-day prayer with the Prophet (s.a.w) and a beggar begged in the mosque, but nobody give him anything. The beggar raised his hands to the sky and said: ‘O Allah! You witnessed that I begged in the mosque of the Prophet (s.a.w), but nobody give me anything.’ Ali at that moment is in the bowing down position while praying; he made a sign with his right finger upon which is a ring. The beggar went to him and took it. The Prophet (s.a.w) saw what has happened and when he finished praying he raise his hands to the Heavens and said: ‘O Allah! Moses has asked You saying: **‘O my Lord! Open for me my chest (grant me self-confidence, contentment, and boldness). And ease my task for me; And make loose the knot (the defect) from my tongue, (i.e. remove the incorrectness from my speech. That they understand my speech, And appoint for me a helper from my family, Aaron, my brother; Increase my strength with him, And let him share my task (of conveying Allah's Message and Prophethood)’ (20:25-32).** You revealed to him some verses in the Qur’an saying: **We will strengthen your**

arm through your brother, and give you both power, so they shall not be able to harm you, with Our Ayat (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.), you two as well as those who follow you will be the victors' (28:35). O Allah! I am Muhammad, Your chosen, O Allah open for me my chest, ease my task for me, appoint for me a helper from my family, Ali and let him share my task.' Abu Dhar said: The Prophet (s.a.w) hardly finished his supplication, when Angel Gabriel descended to him and said: O Muhammad! Read. He said what shall I read? He replied read: **'Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer)' (5:55).** Al-Faqih ibn Mughazili al-Wasiti al-Shafi'i transmitted that it was revealed concerning Ali and 'Wali'^[158] is the person in charge with authority, the verse has affirmed for him 'Wilayah' (power and authority), in the same manner that Allah has affirmed it for himself and His Messenger."

The reply to this will be from many perspectives:

First perspective: There is nothing in what he has mentioned that can be accepted even as a speculation. Nay, all what he has stated are false and lies; it is a form of sophism. If it is assumed that he has written them as a form of speculation; then calling them proofs is highly detestable and objectionable. What is called a proof in the Qur'an and other sources is what conveyed and necessitated sure knowledge, facts, and certainties, such as the words of Allah: **"And they say, 'None shall enter Paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian.' These are their own desires. Say (O Muhammad Peace be upon him), 'Produce your proof if you are truthful' (2:111).** And the word of Allah the Most High: **"Is not He (better than your so-called gods) Who originates creation, and shall thereafter repeat it, and Who provides for you from heaven and earth? Is there any ilah (god) with Allah? Say, 'Bring forth your proofs, if you are truthful' (27:64).** Therefore, the truthful must produce his proofs to show his truthfulness and the truth that is known to be certainly the truth is that which is acknowledged.

This man (the Rafidi), all that he has mentioned of evidences and proofs are lies and thus, he cannot be able to produce one proof which is based on true premise or which all its premises are true, this is because true premise can never be based on falsehood. We will explain – by the Grace of Allah the Most High – while discussing each of them, what will make clear its falsity. Therefore calling them proofs is of the ugliest lies.

Yet again, he relied on exegesis of the Qur'an on the statements that have been narrated from some people although they might be lies against the Prophet (s.a.w), if it is a truth, it has been contradicted by most of the people and if it is the words of somebody whose reliability has not been verified, while most people have contrasted his evidence. He produces a lot of similar types of proofs in contrast to what he is saying, thereby making them self-contradictory and self-negating and real proofs do not contradict each other.

We will explain – by the Grace of Allah the Most High – supported, truthful proofs and evidences that are not self-contradictory in order to prove the lies of what he is advancing as proofs. Surely, what he is advancing are generally clear lies and their falsity cannot be hidden to anybody except the one whose sight has been blinded by Allah. Surely all proofs that showed the Prophethood of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) are true, the Qur'an is the truth and the religion of Islam is true; they have all contradicted what he has mentioned of proofs. The utmost extent of what he is advancing as proofs; if they are pondered over by the sensible, wise person and he pondered over its exigencies; he will discover that he is censuring and disparaging belief (in Allah), the Qur'an and the Prophet (s.a.w).

Second perspective: We say: Replying him on how he interpreted this verse is a right and indispensable and it will be made from many angles:

The first angle: We demanded him to prove the soundness of this hadith, in such a way that it can be a clear proof, because just ascribing it to Tha'alabi's exegesis of the Qur'an or mentioning that there is a consensus on it, from the direction of other than the scholars of hadith, who are truthful and reliable on transmitting it; is

not a proof (and doesn't prove anything) by the consensus of scholars; if we did not know the soundness of its chain of authority. In like manner if a virtue is narrated concerning Abubakar and Umar, that will not be enough to make us believe in its soundness; just because such a narration has been recorded (in a book); by the consensus of scholars.

The second angle: His words: "They all agreed upon that it was revealed concerning Ali," is one of the greatest false claims. Nay all the scholars of hadith agreed upon the fact that it was not revealed concerning Ali; that Ali never give out his ring to a beggar as charity while he is praying; and that the story that is being narrated concerning this issue is a fabricated lie.

With regard to what he has copied from Tha'alabi's exegesis of the Qur'an: Surely, the scholars of hadith have had consensus on that he has recorded a lot of fabricated hadiths. Such as the hadiths that he mentioned at the beginning of each chapter of the Qur'an on its virtues on the authority of Abi Umamah and such as the hadith (under discussion) he has mentioned. This is why scholars of hadith said concerning him: "He is a night wood gatherer."^[159] The same thing can be said about Wahidi his student and those similar to them among the Qur'anic exegetists; they usually quote the sound, the weak and the fabricated. What we aimed here is to explain the lies of this Rafidi or his compound ignorance, when he stated: "They all agreed upon that it was revealed concerning Ali."

I wish I know the person who transmitted that consensus from the scholars who are learned and specialized on consensus in this type of issue? Surely, claiming consensus on this type of issue cannot be accepted except if it emanates from the scholars of hadith and what it contained of agreed upon hadiths and differed upon hadiths. If a scholastic theologian, an exegetists of the Qur'an, a historian etc., claimed a hadith to be sound, his statement cannot be acceptable without a sound chain of authority. Then how about if he claimed that there is consensus on it?

The third angle: We say that: Those exegetists of the Qur'an from whose books he has quoted, they – and those more learned than

them – have recorded what contradicted the claimed consensus. Tha'alabi has mentioned in his exegesis of the Qur'an, that Abdullah bin Abbas said that the verse was revealed concerning Abubakar. He also recorded from Abdulmalik, who said: "I asked Abu Ja'afar about it (this verse) and he replied: 'They are believers.' He said, I said to him: 'There are people who are saying it is Ali.' He replied: 'Ali is among those who believe.'" There is a similar hadith on the authority of Dhahhak.

The fourth angle: We relieved him from the burden of proving his claimed consensus on this hadith and demanded him to transmit it with one sound chain of authority. The chain of authority that has been mentioned by Tha'alabi is weak and it contained unreliable reporters. What he has quoted from Ibn Maghazali al-Wasiti is weaker and weaker than the hadith of Tha'alabi. Ibn Maghazali has compiled in his book many fabricated hadiths which falsity cannot be hidden to whoever has limited knowledge of hadith. Our request for a sound chain of authority comprises both the hadith of Tha'alabi and that of Ibn Maghazali.

The fifth angle: We say: If what the verse demands is that one shall give Zakat while he has bowed in prayer, in accordance to their claim that Ali gave his ring as charity while he is praying: That will have been a compulsory condition for befriending and loving a person and that Muslims shall only befriend and love Ali. Therefore, they are not demanded to love Hasan and Husain and they are not required to love all the Bani Hashim (progeny, household of the Prophet and his relatives). This has contradicted the consensus of Muslims.

The sixth angle: The phrase in the verse "**Those who** (الَّذِينَ)" is a plural form, and thus it is not giving information about Ali (for he is single).

The seventh angle: Surely Allah will not praise a person except if he does what He considered as praiseworthy: Either an obligatory act or a desirable act; giving charity, freeing a slave, giving a gift to someone, hiring, contracting marriage, divorcing and other forms of transactions are neither obligatory nor desirable actions while praying by the consensus of Muslims. Nay, most of the scholars are

saying that carrying out such actions while praying nullify the prayer even if he (the actor) did not speak, for prayer can be nullified by an understood sign. Other scholars said that: Possession cannot be attained through it due to lack of religious obligation. If this kind of act is desirable the Prophet (s.a.w) would have been doing it and he would have commanded his companions to be doing it and Ali would have done it in other occasions (while praying). Since none of these has happened, it is well known that giving charity while praying is not among the good righteous deeds. Again, giving charity to a beggar is not something that is hinged on a particular time or situation. The person who wants to give charity can do so after finishing his prayer; surely, prayer is an enough undertaking.

The eighth angle: If it is established that such acts are allowed in prayer, it will not be specific to bowing position. Nay, its being while standing or sitting will be more suitable than in bowing position. How can it be said that: You do not have a protector or helper or friend or a lover except the person who is giving out charity while bowing down in prayer? If a person give out charity while standing: Doesn't he deserved this friendship or support or aid or love?

The ninth angle: We say: With regard to the words of Allah the Most High: **Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer)" (5:55).** According to Shia Rafidah opinion, it means that he has paid out Zakat while he is in bowing position in prayer. The fact is that Ali is not among those who Zakat is obligatory upon them, because he is a poor man and Zakat of silver is only obligatory upon the person who possess minimum amount of property liable to payment of Zakat throughout the year and Ali is not one of them.

The tenth angle: Giving out a ring, as Zakat is not sufficient in accordance to the religious verdicts of many scholars, except if it said that Zakat is compulsory upon jewelries (ornaments). Some scholars said that Zakat can be given out from jewelries and they added that its value in cash shall be given out. Valuing what to be

given as Zakat while praying is impossible and value of jewelries changes by the changing condition and situation.

The eleventh angle: This verse is similar to the words of Allah the Most High, such as: **“And perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and Irka' (i.e. bow down or submit yourselves with obedience to Allah) along with ArRaki'un” (2:43).** This is a command to bow down to Allah in obedience. Similar also to the Words of Allah the Exalted: **“O Mary! ‘Submit yourself with obedience to your Lord (Allah, by worshipping none but Him Alone) and prostrate yourself, and Irka'i (bow down etc.) along with Ar-Raki'un (those who bow down etc.)” (3:43).** This is also a command to bow down and submit to Allah.

The twelfth angle: It is sufficiently known by the scholars of the exegesis of the Qur'an generation after generation that this verse was revealed on the prohibition of befriending and supporting unbelievers and the command to love, befriend and support believers. That was when some hypocrites such as Abdullah bin Ubay were befriending the Jews, saying: “I fear the vicissitude of time.” Some believers such as Ubadah bin Samit said: “As for me! O Messenger of Allah, I only supports Allah and His Messenger and I have nothing to do with the alliance of those unbelievers and befriending them.”

The thirteenth angle: The context and flow of the verse proves our explanations to whoever ponders over the Qur'an. Allah the Most High said: **“O you who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as Auliya' (friends, protectors, helpers, etc.), they are but Auliya' to one another. And if any amongst you takes them as Auliya', then surely he is one of them. Verily, Allah guides not those people who are the Zalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers and unjust)” (5:51).** This is a prohibition of befriending Jews and Christians. Then He the Exalted said: **“And you see those in whose hearts there is a disease (of hypocrisy), they hurry to their friendship, saying: "We fear lest some misfortune of a disaster may befall us." Perhaps Allah may bring a victory or a decision according to His Will. Then they will become regretful**

for what they have been keeping as a secret in themselves. And those who believe will say: "Are these the men (hypocrites) who swore their strongest oaths by Allah that they were with you (Muslims)?" All that they did has been in vain (because of their hypocrisy), and they have become the losers" (5:52-53). This is a description of those in whose hearts there is disease; those who are befriending unbelievers such as the hypocrites. Then Allah the Most Sublime stated: **"O you who believe! Whoever from among you turns back from his religion (Islam), Allah will bring a people whom He will love and they will love Him; humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is AllSufficient for His creatures' needs, AllKnower"** (5:54). Here Allah mentioned those apostates, who renounced faith and He maintained that they cannot harm Him in the least and that He will replace them with better men. Thereafter, Allah the Most high said: **"Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer). And whosoever takes Allah, His Messenger, and those who have believed, as Protectors, then the party of Allah will be the victorious"** (5:55-56). These verses encompasses the conditions of those who embrace Islam among the hypocrites, those who renounce Islam and the condition of believers who remained steadfast and firm in Islam both outwardly and inwardly.

The context of this verse is in plural form and that will naturally obligate a certain, sure knowledge that any person who ponder over it cannot be able to reject that, this verse is general on all believers who are described with those characteristics and that it is not exclusive to a particular person; it is not specific to Abubakar or Umar or Uthman or Ali or any other particular individual; but those people more deserved to be encompassed by it than anyone else.

The fourteenth angle: The ideas that have been expressed in that hadith are known to be clear lies against the Prophet (s.a.w), for surely Ali is not the leader of all the righteous. Nay, the leader of this community is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Ali also is not the slayer of all the infidels. Nay, he slayed some infidels, in the same manner other people have also killed some infidels and anybody in the army of Islam who killed infidels is only a slayer of some infidels.

The same thing can be applied to his words: "Successful is the one who aided him and forsaken is the one who abandon him." This statement has contradicted the reality and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) cannot say anything but the truth: Especially if you consider the belief of Shia Rafidah; for they are claiming that all the Islamic community has abandoned him up to the time when Uthman was murdered. And it is well known that the Islamic community has been victorious during the periods of the three Caliphs, in such a manner that similar victories were not attained after their periods. When Uthman was murdered, people become divided into three groups: A party aided him and fought on his side, a party fought him and a party abandoned him and remained neutral to both first two parties. Those who fought with him are not victorious neither against those who fought him nor against those remained neutral and yet they are not victorious on the unbelievers. Nay, those who fought him were aided over him and the affair become their own when Mu'awiyah become the Caliph; they fought and were victorious over unbelievers and they conquered new countries and regions. Therefore, Ali is victorious, like the victory of those similar to him in fighting the Kharijites and unbelievers.

The supplication that was mentioned that the Prophet (s.a.w) has made after Ali has given a ring to a beggar as charity is a lie. It is well known that the Prophet's companions have spent a lot of money and property whenever the need arise and what they have spent is more beneficial than giving a ring to a beggar as charity. It come in sound hadiths: Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri, who said: ***"Allah's Apostle addressed the people saying, 'Allah has given option to a slave to choose this world or what is with Him. The slave has***

*chosen what is with Allah,' Abubakar wept, and we were astonished at his weeping caused by what the Prophet mentioned as to a Slave (of Allah) who had been offered a choice, (we learned later on) that Allah's Apostle himself was the person who was given the choice, and that Abubakar knew best of all of us. Allah's Apostle added, 'The person who has favored me most of all both with his company and wealth, is Abubakar. If I were to take a Khalil (bosom friend) other than my Lord, I would have taken Abubakar as such, but (what relates us) is the Islamic brotherhood and friendliness. All the gates of the Mosque should be closed except the gate of Abubakar" (Bukhari). 'Uthman (r.a) gave 10,000 gold dinars, three hundred fully equipped camels, and fifty horses for this Battle of Tabuk. Besides, he supplied three hundred of the learned companions of the Prophet (s.a.w) with full provisions to accompany the army. The Prophet's reaction was, **"Nothing will hurt 'Uthman after this day."** **The Prophet then prayed, "O Allah, be pleased with 'Uthman, for I am pleased with him"** (Tirmidhi, Ahmad).*

And again: How can it be suitable for the Prophet (s.a.w) to say in Madina – after the migration and Allah has given him victory – “appoint for me a helper from my family, Ali and let him share in my task,” while already Allah has elevated him, aided him and given him victory with the aid of the believers. Allah the Most High has said: **“And if they intend to deceive you, then verily, Allah is All-Sufficient for you. He it is Who has supported you with His Help and with the believers” (8:62).** And He the Exalted said: **“If you help him (Muhammad SAW) not (it does not matter), for Allah did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out, the second of two, when they (Muhammad and Abubakar) were in the cave, and he (SAW) said to his companion (Abubakar): "Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us." Then Allah sent down His Sakinah (calmness, tranquility, peace, etc.) upon him, and strengthened him with forces (angels) which you saw not, and made the word of those who disbelieved the lowermost, while it was the Word of Allah that became the uppermost, and**

Allah is All-Mighty, All-Wise” (9:40). The person who was with him when Allah aided him after being expelled by the unbelievers (from Makka) is Abubakar and they are the two while Allah is the third with them. On the day of the battle of Badr, a shade was prepared for the Prophet (s.a.w) and the only person who he brought in to stay with him inside it was Abubakar – to the exclusion of all other companions – and all the Prophet’s companions have aided the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), their efforts are acknowledged and praiseworthy and their works are accepted and blessed.

Therefore, whoever claimed that the Prophet (s.a.w) has supplicated to Allah, to increase his strength with a particular person among the people, in the like manner that Moses (a.s) prayed to Allah to increase his strength with Aaron (a.s) has lied against the Prophet (s.a.w) and lessen his rights and status. Undoubtedly, Shia Rafidah is a derivative of polytheism, atheism, and hypocrisy; sometimes those traits appear in them and sometimes they are hidden.

The fifteenth angle: The utmost teaching of the verse is that believers shall support, help and befriend believers and they shall support, help and support Ali. Undoubtedly, loving, befriending and supporting Ali is obligatory upon all believers, in the like manner that it is compulsory upon each believer to love, befriend and support believers similar to him. Allah the Most High said: “... **But if you help one another against him (Muhammad), then verily, Allah is his Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.), and Jibrael (Gabriel), and the righteous among the believers, and furthermore, the angels are his helpers.**” (66:4). Thus, Allah has explained that all righteous believers are helpers of the Prophet (s.a.w). Allah is his helper and protector and Angel Gabriel (a.s) is his helper. There is nothing in this verse that showed that whoever is an aid or a friend to another person has automatically become his leader to the exclusion of all other people and that he will administer his affairs to the exclusion of all other people..

The sixteenth angle: Surely, if Allah is talking about sovereignty, which is government and administration, He would have said: “Surely, the one who will govern you is Allah, His Messenger and the

believers,” and He would not state: “And whosoever takes Allah, His Messenger...,” for it will not be said to those who a leader is appointed over them: “They have taken him,” but it will be said: “He has become their leader (or he has taken over authority).”

The seventeenth angle: Surely, Allah is beyond being described as becoming a leader of His slaves or that He is their president – Exalted and Sublime He is and Holy are His Names – for surely, He is their Creator, Sustainer, Lord, and their Owner, to Him belongs the creation and the commandments. We cannot say that Allah is the commander of the faithful, in the like manner some leaders, such as Ali bin Abi Talib, are given the title. Nay, even the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) cannot be called a man with power and authority for his status and rank are greater than that. Nay, they used to call Abubakar the successor of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and the first person from among the successors (Caliphs) to be called commander of the faithful, is Umar.

The eighteenth angle: Undoubtedly, not everybody that is ruled by a just ruler is among the party of Allah and he will be victorious. Certainly, just rulers have among their subjects hypocrites and infidels, in the like manner that there are was in the city of the Prophet (s.a.w) and under his authority none Muslims under Muslims protection (Jews) and hypocrites.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF TABLIG (DECLARATION) IS ON LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated “The second evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **“O Messenger (Muhammad)! Proclaim (the Message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord. And if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message. Allah will protect you from mankind. Verily, Allah guides not the people who disbelieve” (5:67).** There is consensus that it was revealed concerning Ali. Abu Nu’aim al-Hafiz – one of the Ahlus Sunnah scholars - narrated it with its chain of authority to Atiyyah, he said: ‘This verse was revealed to the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning Ali bin Abi Talib.’ From the exegesis of the Qur’an by Tha’alabi who said: ‘It means convey what has been revealed to you concerning the virtues of Ali.’ When this verse was revealed he took the hand of Ali and said: ‘Whoever beloved friend (Mawla) I am, Ali is also his beloved friend.’ Since the Prophet (s.a.w) is the beloved friend of Abubakar, Umar and the rest of the companions by consensus (of all scholars), it entailed that Ali is also their beloved friend and thus, he is there leader.

It comes in Tha’alab’s exegesis of the Qur’an that: When the Prophet (s.a.w) is in Ghadir Khum, he called upon people and they gathered around him. He took hold of the hand of Ali and said: ‘Whoever beloved friend (Mawla)^[160] I am, Ali is also his beloved friend.’ This statement spread all over the country and it reached Harith bin Mu’aman al-Fihri. He come to the Prophet (s.a.w), riding on his She-camel, until he reached Abtah (a place in Makka). After coming down of his She-camel, made it lay down and tied it, he proceed to the Prophet (s.a.w) who is among many of his companions and to him: ‘O Muhammad! You commanded us to believe that there is nobody worthy of being worshipped but Allah and that you are His Messenger and we accepted that from you. You commanded us to pray five times daily and we accepted that from you. You commanded us to purify our wealth by paying Zakat and we

accepted that from you. You asked us to fast for a month and we accepted that from you. And you commanded us to perform pilgrimage to the House of Allah and we accepted that from you. After all these you are not satisfied until you raise the status of your cousin and give him preference over us and you said: ***'Whoever beloved friend (Mawla) I am, Ali is also his beloved friend.'*** Is this from you or from Allah? The Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'I swear by Allah Who has no partner, this is a command from Allah.' Harith turned back to his mount while he is saying: 'O Allah if this is the truth from You, then rain upon us stones from the sky or bring upon us a painful torment.' He did not reach his mount for Allah sent a stone against him which strike his head and dropped out from his anus. Then Allah the Most High revealed: **"A questioner asked concerning a torment about to befall Upon the disbelievers, which none can avert, From Allah, the Lord of the ways of ascent" (70:1-3).** Naqqash who is among the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah has recorded this in his exegesis of the Qur'an."

We reply to the above from many perspectives: Firstly: This is a greater lie and fabrication than the first, as we will explain by the grace of Allah the Exalted. With regard to his words: "There is consensus that it was revealed concerning Ali," it is the greatest lie he has stated concerning the verse for none of the scholars that knew what they are saying say this or that. What Abu Nu'aim has recorded in his book 'Hilyatul Awliya,' or 'Fada'il Sahabah,' and what was recorded by Naqqash, Tha'alabi, Wahidi and those scholars similar to them in their books on exegesis of the Qur'an contained a lot of lies and fabrications, according to the consensus of scholars of hadith. They have also agreed and have consensus upon the fact that this hadith that has been mentioned and which is also recorded by Tha'alabi in his exegesis of the Qur'an is fabricated. We will mention evidences that will explain that it is a fabricated hadith and Tha'alabi is not among the scholars of hadith and its sciences.

Our aim here is to mention a principle and we say: Transmitted hadiths contained a lot of truth and a lot of lies and the authority to which we refer in order to differentiate between them is the science

of hadith; in the same manner that we refer to grammarians to differentiate between Arabic grammar and the grammar that is not Arabic, we refer to scholars of linguistics to know what is part of a language and what is not part of a language, in like manner we refer to the scholars of medicine, poetry, literature etc.; each science has men who are versed in it and the scholars of hadith are mightier than those in status, greater in truthfulness, higher in rank and more religious.

Second perspectives: In this hadith, many things proved that it is a fabricated lie and they can be viewed from many angles. Consider what he has stated in that story of Ghadir Khum. We say: All people have had consensus that what the Prophet (s.a.w) said in Ghadir Khum was during his return from farewell pilgrimage and Shia have accepted this and they have made it a day of celebration. It is on the 18th of Dhul Hijjah and the Prophet did not return to Makka after that. Nay, he returned to Madina after the farewell pilgrimage and live there throughout the months Dhul Hijjah, Muharram and Safar and he died at the begging of Rabi'ul Awwal. In this hadith it is mentioned that after the Prophet has made the speech in Ghadir Khum and it spread all over the country, Harith come to him while he is in Abtah, and Abtah is a place in Makka. Therefore, this is a fabricated lie by an ignorant man who does not know when the story of Ghadir Khum took place.

Furthermore, this chapter of the Qur'an titled al-Ma'arij (Chapter Seventy) was revealed in Makka by the consensus of men of knowledge. It was revealed in Makka before immigration to Madina and therefore, it was revealed before Ghadir Khum by ten years or more than that. Thus, how can it be stated that it was revealed after Ghadir Khum?

With regard to the verse, he has quoted which is: **“And (remember) when they said: "O Allah! If this (the Quran) is indeed the truth (revealed) from You, then rain down stones on us from the sky or bring on us a painful torment” (8:32)**; it well known that, that Chapter of the Qur'an was revealed after the battle of Badr, by the consensus of scholars – that is before the incidence of Ghadir Khum

by many years - of exegesis of the Qur'an. Those scholar have consensus that the verse was revealed because of what the polytheists such as Abu Jahl used to say to the Prophet (s.a.w) before he immigrated to Madina and in this verse Allah made him to remember what they have been saying, for the begging of the verse started with: **"And (remember) when they said..."**, meaning remember what they have said (in the past).

Furthermore, it is mentioned in this hadith that the person who made the statement said that the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded him with the five pillars of Islam and he has accepted them and therefore, he is a Muslim, for he said: "We have accepted that from you," and it is well known that nobody among the Muslims is afflicted with such a punishment during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w). Yet again, this man is not known among the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w), nay this is the types of names that you find among the mystics and the types of myths that you find in books of fables such as Antar and Dahlama.

The third perspective: Your claim that you have proven his leadership (Imamah) with the Qur'an, while there is absolutely nothing in that clear verse of the Qur'an that prove your contention. The verse stated: **"O Messenger (Muhammad)! Proclaim (the Message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord. And if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message. Allah will protect you from mankind. Verily, Allah guides not the people who disbelieve" (5:67)**. This expression is general to all what has been revealed to him from his Lord and it is not pointing to any specific thing or issue. Therefore, the claim of the claimant that the leadership of Ali is among the things he has conveyed or among the things he was commanded to convey cannot be proven by the Qur'an alone, for there is nothing in it pointing to that specific issue. If such a claim is proven through narrations, then it will be said it has been proven by hadith and not by the Qur'an. Thus, whoever claimed that the Qur'an is proving the leadership of Ali and that it is among what he was commanded to convey has fabricated lies

against the Qur'an. The Qur'an has not showed that, neither generally nor specifically.

The fourth perspective: We say: with regard to this verse – and with what is known of the condition of the Prophet (s.a.w) – it is contrary to what this Rafidi mentioned, which is: Allah did not reveal to him and He did not command him (to convey such a message), for surely if it is among what he has been commanded to convey, he will have conveyed it, because he does not disobey Allah. That is why Aisha said: ***“He who presumes that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) concealed anything, from the Book, of Allah fabricates the greatest lie because Allah says “O Messenger (Muhammad)! Proclaim (the Message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord. And if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message. Allah will protect you from mankind. Verily, Allah guides not the people who disbelieve” (5: 67) (Muslim).*** Undoubtedly, all the scholars knew out of necessity that the Prophet (s.a.w) did not convey anything about the leadership or successorship of Ali and they have many ways through which they establish this fact among which are:

This kind of issue is among the issues that human sentiments and desires like to convey and transmit and thus, if it is stated by the Prophet it will be transmitted by the people, in the like manner that they have transmitted similar hadiths, especially if you consider a lot of fabricated, baseless hadith that has been transmitted on the virtues of Ali. Then why shall the truth that has been conveyed to people not be transmitted? This is because the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded his community to convey what they heard from him and therefore, it is forbidden for them to conceal what he has commanded them to convey and transmit to all people.

And among those ways is that: When the Prophet (s.a.w) died, some men among the Ansar requested that there shall be a leader from among them and a leader from among the Muhajirun. But they (the Muhajirun) rejected that proposal and said: “Leadership can only be among Quraish,” and the Prophet’s companions in many occasions

have mentioned the hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w) that he said: ***“The rulers shall be from the Quraish. (Nasa’i, No: 5942).*** And nobody among them, neither in the meeting nor in any other occasion mention anything about the leadership of Ali. All the Muslims gave their vows of allegiance to Abubakar and at that time. Men of Bani Abdu Munaf (Bani Umayyah, Bani Hashim etc.) have a strong inclination towards Ali and they want him to be the leader, but despite that none of them mention this text (that Ali is appointed by the Prophet to be the Caliph). This is how the matter continued during the period of Umar and Uthman and during his period when he became the Caliph; neither he by himself, nor any person among his family and progeny and nobody among the known Prophet’s companions mention such text. This text appeared after their time.

SEGMENT: NEGATING RAFIDI'S CLAIM THAT THE VERSE OF PERFECTION OF RELIGION IS ON LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The third evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **'...This day, I have perfected your religion for you, completed My Favor upon you, and have chosen for you Islam as your religion. But as for him who is forced by severe hunger, with no inclination to sin (such can eat these above-mentioned meats), then surely, Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful'** (5:3). After it was revealed the Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Allah is Greater, for perfection of religion, completion of favor and the Lord's pleasure with my message and the leadership of Ali after me.' Then he said: 'Whoever beloved friend I am, Ali also is his beloved friend. O Allah befriend whoever befriend him and be an enemy to whoever is an enemy to him, aid whoever aids him and abandon whoever forsake him.'"

The answer to the above contention is from many perspectives:

The first perspective: Whoever is proving an issue with a hadith shall explain its soundness for the mere ascribing it to what Abu Nu'aim has recorded in his book does not prove that it is sound by the consensus of all people: Scholars of Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. Surely Abu Nu'aim has recorded many weak, nay fabricated hadiths by the consensus of scholars of hadith from both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. This man (Abu Nu'aim), although he is a Hafiz,^[161] has had a lot of hadith and has narrated a lot of hadith; but he usually recorded – as is the custom of hadith scholars like him – all the hadiths on a particular issue (whether sound or fabricated) in a particular chapter, so that people will know them (and not in order to accept fabrications, but to know them).^[162]

The second perspective: This hadith is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of fabricated hadiths. It is known by the scholars of hadith and those who are referred to this type of issue as

fabricated. This is the reason why this hadith cannot be found in all books of hadith that can be referred to.

The third perspective: It come in sound books of hadith, Masanid, [\[163\]](#) and exegesis of the Qur'an that this verse was revealed to the Prophet (s.a.w) while he was standing in Arafat. Narrated 'Umar bin Al-Khattab: ***“Once a Jew said to me, ‘O the chief of believers! There is a verse in your Holy Book which is read by all of you (Muslims), and had it been revealed to us, we would have taken that day (on which it was revealed as a day of celebration.’ ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab asked, ‘Which is that verse?’ The Jew replied, ‘This day I have perfected your religion For you, completed My favor upon you, And have chosen for you Islam as your religion.’ (5:3) ‘Umar replied,’No doubt, we know when and where this verse was revealed to the Prophet. It was Friday and the Prophet was standing at ‘Arafat (i.e. the Day of Hajj)’” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** This hadith has come in many versions and it is transmitted in the books of Muslims such as Sihah [\[164\]](#) (sound books of hadiths), Masanid (see footnote 163 above), Jawa'mie, [\[165\]](#) history and exegesis of the Qur'an etc., and that was nine days before the day of Ghadir Khum; it was on Friday ninth of Dhul Hijjah. Then how can anybody say that it was revealed on the day of Ghadir Khum?

The fourth perspective: This verse does not contain any indication to Ali or his leadership on all considerations and from all perspectives. Nay, Allah informed about the perfection of religion and completion of favor on the believers and that He has chosen Islam as the religion of Muslims. Therefore, the claim of a claimant that the Qur'an indicate the leadership of Ali from this angle is an apparent, very clear lie.

The fifth perspective: The sentences that are mentioned in the hadith: “O Allah, befriend whoever befriend him and be an enemy to whoever is an enemy to him. And aid whoever aids him and forsake whoever abandon him,” is a lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith. With regard to his words: “Whoever beloved friend I am, Ali is also his beloved friend.” There are two opinions of the scholars

concerning it and we will mention them in the right place – by the Grace of Allah.

The sixth perspective: Undoubtedly the supplications of the Prophet (s.a.w) are accepted (by Allah), but this supplication has not been accepted and by that it is known that the Prophet (s.a.w) did not make this supplication. It is well known that when Ali becomes the Caliph the Prophet's companions and the rest of the Muslims split into three groups: A group fought on his side, a group fought him and a group remained neutral and most of the first and foremost to embrace Islam remained neutral. And those who fought him were not forsaken, nay they continued to be aided (i.e. Mu'awiyah become the ruler) and victorious, conquering new countries and fighting the unbelievers. In a sound hadith the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“There will always be a party in my community aiding the truth, they will not be harmed by those who opposed them or forsake them, until the affairs of Allah arrive.” Mu'az bin Jabal said: “They are the people of Syria” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

The army that fought with Mu'awiyah were never forsaken, nay even when they fought Ali. Then how can anybody claim that the Prophet (s.a.w) supplicated: “O Allah, aid whoever aid him and forsake whoever abandon him,” while those who fought on his side were not victorious over those people (who fought him). Nay, Shia that are claiming Ali is specifically and especially their own are still forsaken and defeated and they cannot attain victory except with the help of other people: Either Muslims or unbelievers and they are claiming that they are his aids and helpers. Then where is the aid of Allah to the one who aided him? This fact and other proofs clearly showed that this hadith was fabricated.

SEGMENT: NEGATING ARGUMENT OF THE RAFIDI WITH THE VERSE OF THE STAR ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The fourth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **'By the star when it goes down, (or vanishes). Your companion (Muhammad SAW) has neither gone astray nor has erred' (53:1-2)**. The jurist Ali bin Maghazali ash-Shafi'i narrated with its chain of authority to Ibn Abbas, who said: 'I was sitting before the Prophet (s.a.w) with some youths of Bani Hashim and a star fall down from the sky. The Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Whoever this star falls in his house; he will be my successor.' The youths of Bani Hashim stood up and checked, they found that it has fallen inside the house of Ali. They said: 'O Messenger of Allah! You have erred in your love for Ali.' At that moment, Allah the Most High revealed: **'By the star when it goes down, (or vanishes). Your companion (Muhammad SAW) has neither gone astray nor has erred' (53:1-2).**"

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives: Firstly: We request him to prove the soundness of this hadith, as earlier mentioned. This because speaking without knowledge is forbidden by texts and consensus of Muslims scholars. Allah the most Exalted said: **"And follow not (O man i.e., say not, or do not or witness not, etc.) that of which you have no knowledge (e.g. one's saying: "I have seen," while in fact he has not seen, or "I have heard," while he has not heard). Verily! The hearing, and the sight, and the heart, of each of those you will be questioned (by Allah)" (17:36)**. And He the Most High said in another verse: **"Say (O Muhammad SAW): "(But) the things that my Lord has indeed forbidden are AlFawahish (great evil sins, every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse, etc.) whether committed openly or secretly, sins (of all kinds), unrighteous oppression, joining partners (in worship) with Allah for which He has given no authority, and saying things about Allah of which you have no knowledge" (7:33)**.

Whatever the Messenger of Allah brought from Allah is authority, therefore the Qur'an is an authority and the Sunnah is an authority, but we cannot know that the Prophet (s.a.w) has brought it except with the conveyance of the truthful from Allah. whoever argue with any transmitted statement from the Prophet (s.a.w) shall necessarily verify its soundness before he believe in what it teaches and consider it a proof and if he advance it to someone as an evidence, it rest upon him to explain its soundness, if otherwise he is talking without knowledge and arguing with ignorance.

How can he advance an evidence on issues hinged upon principle of religion, in which he disparage the best century of Islam, the generality of the Muslims and the chiefs of those who are close friends of Allah, with a hadith which soundness he doesn't know! If it is said to him: "Did you know that this has taken place?" If he replied: "I knew that!" He told a lie, for how did he arrive to the knowledge that it has taken place? It will be said to him: "How did you arrived at its truthfulness and that can never be known except with chain of authority and knowing the condition of the narrators?" You did not know that, and if you have known that, you will realize that it is a fabricated lie. If he said: "I didn't know!" Then how did you find it suitable to argue with what you did not know its soundness?

The second perspective: This is a lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith. This man (Maghazili), is not among the scholars of hadith, he is like Abu Nu'aim and others similar to him. He is also among those compilers of hadith who have recorded many sound hadith and some fabricated ones such as Tha'alabi and those similar to him. Nay, the science of hadith is not among the specialties of Ibn Maghazili, he just compiled what he find from people's books concerning the virtues of Ali, as Akhtab al-Khawarizmi has done; both of them are not scholars of hadith and both of them compiled lies and fabricated hadiths, which falsity cannot be hidden to junior scholars of hadith and its transmission.

The third perspective: Among the things that explained that it is a fabricated lie is the claim that Ibn Abbas has witnessed its (Chapter 53 of the Qur'an) revelation when a star falls in Ali's house. The fact

is that this chapter of the Qur'an is among the Chapters that are revealed very early in Makka – by the consensus of scholars – and at the time the Prophet (s.a.w) died Ibn Abbas is still a youth who has not yet reached the age of legal responsibility (puberty). This is what he said concerning himself in sound hadiths recorded by both Bukhari and Muslim. Therefore, when this Chapter was revealed it might be that he was not born or he is just a child that cannot differentiate what is happening around him. When the Prophet (s.a.w) immigrated to Madina, Ibn Abbas was a child of about five years. The nearest opinion to the truth is that he was not born when this Chapter was revealed, for it is one of the earliest Chapters of the Qur'an to be revealed (in Makka).

The fourth perspective: A star has never falls down from the sky in Makka or Madina or any other city (in the world). When the Prophet (s.a.w) was sent, a lot of shooting star are seen flying by, but never does a star falls to the ground. Such preternatural phenomena are not known to occur in the world, nay this type of preternatural phenomena has never occurred in the world and nobody can narrate this type of story except the most impudent, insolent person, the most reckless liar and the one with less religion and modesty. This type of story cannot spread but among the most ignorant, the most foolish and those that possess little knowledge and science. [\[166\]](#)

The fifth perspective: Undoubtedly Chapter fifty-three of the Qur'an was revealed at the beginning of Islam and at that time Ali is a little boy and it is apparent that at that time he did not reach the legal age of maturity and he is not married to Fatima. [\[167\]](#) At that time the obligatory prayers of four, three and two units is not decreed. Zakat, pilgrimage, fasting in the month of Ramadan and general principles of Islam has not yet been decreed. The issue of legate of leadership will come last, - if at all it is true. The Shia have claimed that it was announced at Ghadir Khum, then how can it be true that it was revealed at that time?

The sixth perspective: Scholars of exegesis of the Qur'an have a consensus that contradicted this fable. They said that the stars that Allah swore with are either stars of the sky or stars of the Qur'an

etc., and nobody say that it is a star that fall in the house of somebody in Makka.

The seven perspectives: Whoever said to the Prophet (s.a.w): “You have erred,” is an unbeliever and the Prophet (s.a.w) never commands unbelievers to practice branches of religion before they believe in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and embrace Islam.

The eighth perspective: This star, if it is lightening that struck the house of somebody, then such a phenomenon is not an honor to him. If it is a star; it is well known that stars do not leave their orbits. If it is a shooting star; it is well known that they are sent to strike down devils and it does not reach the earth (before it burns out). If we assumed that the devil that it was sent to strike, reaches the house of Ali and that is why it falls there and burnt him, then this cannot be considered an honor to him; although this has never happened.

SEGMENT: NEGATING ARGUMENTS OF THE RAFID WITH THE VERSE OF CLEANSING ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The fifth evidence: The words of Allah the Most high: **‘...Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification’ (33:33).** Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded in his Musnad from Wasilah bin Asqah: ‘I sought for Ali in his house and Fatima told me he has gone to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). He said they all come (Hasan, Husain, Fatima and Ali) and entered. He made Ali sit on his left side, Fatima on his right side and Hasan and Husain in front of him and then he covered them with his garment and recited: **‘...Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification’ (33:33).** Then he prayed: ‘O Allah! These are my family in truth.’ Umm Salma said while the Prophet was in her house, Fatima comes in with an earthen ware pot containing some food. He said to her: ‘Call for me your husband and your children.’ Ali, Hasan and Husain come and entered before him, sat down and ate from the pot. She said I was inside the room praying and Allah revealed: **‘...Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.) from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet SAW), and to purify you with a thorough purification’ (33:33).** She said: He took a garment and covered them, then he remove his hand and raised it to the sky and said: ‘Those are members of my family, so remove from them evil deeds and purify them thoroughly.’ He repeated that. She said I entered my head and said: ‘And I am among them, O Messenger of Allah! He replied: ‘You are surely, in goodness.’

This verse proved infallibility with emphasis on “only to (إنما)” placing the letter “L (اللام)” in the statement (tense) and making it exclusive to them by His words: ‘People of the house.’ He repeated the word ‘to purify you,’ and emphasized it with the phrase ‘through purification.’

Other than them are not infallible and therefore leadership is the right of Ali. And because he has made claims to it during his period many times, such as his statement: 'Beware! By Allah the son of Abu Quhafah (Abubakar) dressed himself with it (the Caliphate) and he certainly knew that my position in relation to it was the same as the position of the axis in relation to the hand-mill.' It was confirmed that evil has been removed from him. Therefore, he is telling the truth. Thus he is the leader."

Our reply is: This hadith is generally well known. It come in sound hadiths that the prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain: ***"O Allah, surely those are members of my family! Thus, remove from them evil and cleans them thoroughly."*** Muslim recorded that: ***"Aisha reported that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) went out one morning wearing a striped cloak of the black camel's hair that there came Hasan bin Ali. He wrapped him under it, then came Husain and he wrapped him under it along with the other one (Hasan). Then came Fatima and he took her under it, then came 'Ali and he also took him under it and then said: 'Allah only desires to take away any uncleanness from you, O people of the household, and purify you (thorough purifying)'" (Muslim).*** This hadith is well known as reported by Umm Salma, and as recorded by Ahmad and Tirmidhi; but there is nothing in it proving that they are infallible or that they are leaders (in charge with authority after the Prophet). What we have mentioned above can be established from two perspectives:

Firstly: the words of Allah: ***'...Allah wishes only to remove ArRijs (evil deeds and sins, etc.)^[168] from you, O members of the family (of the Prophet), and to purify you with a thorough purification' (33:33).*** Are like His words: ***"...Allah does not want to place you in difficulty, but He wants to purify you, and to complete His Favor on you that you may be thankful" (5:6).*** And like His words: ***"Allah wishes to make clear (what is lawful and what is unlawful) to you, and to show you the ways of those before you, and accept your repentance, and Allah is All-Knower, AllWise. Allah wishes to accept your repentance, but***

those who follow their lusts, wish that you (believers) should deviate tremendously away from the Right Path: (4:26-27).

Surely the words of Allah in these verses encompasses His love and acceptance of what He has commanded and that He has decreed them upon the believers and commanded them to practice them. There is nothing in the verses to show that Allah has created infallibility or has decreed that those people are infallible or that they will certainly become infallible.

The proof of our assertion is that after the revelation of this verse the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“O Allah! Those are members of my household, remove from them all evil and cleanse them thoroughly.”*** In this supplication he asked Allah to remove from them evil and cleans them, and if the verse encompass information that Allah has removed from them evil and has cleansed them, he will not need to supplicate for that again.

If it said: Let us assume that the Qur'an did not show the occurrence of cleansing and removal of evil; but the prayer of the Prophet (s.a.w) for them proved that it has taken place for his supplications are accepted by Allah.

We reply that: What we are aiming to prove is that the Qur'an did not show what he claimed of the occurrence of cleansing and removal of evil, let alone the occurrence of infallibility and leadership (over Muslims)! We will discuss the claimed infallibility and leadership in another place- by the Will of Allah.

Secondly: Let us assume that the Qur'an has proven that they are cleanses and that evil has been removed from them, in the same manner that the prayer of the Prophet (s.a.w) entailed that the cleansing and removal of evil prayed for them will surely take place; but there is nothing that showed they are infallible from making mistakes. What proved our statement is that Allah did not Will with what he commanded the Prophet's wives that mistakes shall not emanate from any of them; for surely mistakes are forgiven to them and forgiven to other people. The context of the verse showed that He Will to remove from them great sins and illegal sexual intercourse and cleanse them thoroughly from great sins and other

sins. The word “evil,” is general which entailed that Allah want to remove from them all evils for the Prophet has supplicated for them.

Summarily the cleansing that Allah Willed and which the Prophet (s.a.w) has supplicated for, is not infallibility by consensus of the Muslims scholars, for certainly, the Ahlus Sunnah do not believe in any infallibles other than the Prophets; but Shia Rafidah are saying: “There is no infallible except the Prophet and the Imam. There is consensus (among them) in negating the exclusive infallibility of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the Imam from the wives of the Prophet (s.a.w), his daughter and other women.” If that is the case, the cleansing that was supplicated for the four (Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain) does not entail infallibility which is exclusive to the Prophet (s.a.w) and the Imam – according to their opinion – and thus there is nothing in the prayer of the Prophet (s.a.w) request for their infallibility, neither for Ali nor for anyone else. This is because he prayed for all the four for cleansing and he did not exclude anybody.

Concerning his (Rafidi’s) contention that: “Ali has claimed it. It has been confirmed that evil has been removed from him and therefore he is telling the truth.”

We reply that: Firstly: We do not accept that Ali has claimed it, nay we knew by certain knowledge, out of necessity (in the religion of Islam) that Ali never claimed leadership until after the murder of Uthman; although in his heart he incline towards it and love to be appointed, but he never say: I am the leader! Or I am infallible and he never say that the prophet (s.a.w) has appointed me to be the leader after him or that he has made obedience to me by the people obligatory or any similar words. Nay we knew out of necessity that whoever narrated these types of words has lied against him, for we knew that Ali fears Allah and thus, he cannot make such clear false claims which all the Prophet’s companions knew its falsity.

With regard to his (Rafidi’s) words (that Ali said): “Beware! By Allah the son of Abu Quhafah (Abubakar) dressed himself with it (the Caliphate) and he certainly knew that my position in relation to it was the same as the position of the axis in relation to the hand-mill.”

We say: Firstly: Where is the chain of authority of this narration, in such a manner that reliable person transmit from a reliable person until it reaches Ali? This can never be found, this is something found in Nahjul Balaghah and similar (Shia Rafidah) books. Scholars of hadith knew most of those sermons are fabricated against Ali and that is why most of it could not be found in earlier books and they do not have any known chain of authority. From which source did they copied the above particular statement? At this junction it is not for us to explain the falsity of the above statement, for it is sufficient for us to demand the soundness of this narration. This is because Allah has not made it obligatory upon His slaves to believe in what has not been proven to be true. Nay, it is forbidden by the consensus of scholars to believe in what has not been proven to be true and sound, especially if you consider the legal maxim: "It is forbidden to make obligatory what is impossible to be carried out." Surely this is one of the greatest ways of obligating on people what is unbearable or bearing them intolerable burden. How can anybody be able to prove that Ali has claimed that he is the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w) with this type of story, which has been fabricated during the fourth century of Islam, while at that time there are many people lying against him and they (Shia Rafida) have a state that accepts whatever they say; whether true or false and nobody is asking them to prove the soundness of what they are narrating? We rely on this reply on the issue of Ali's successorship to the Prophet (s.a.w) and that on which is between us and Allah the Most High.

Furthermore, we knew that Ali is one of those who fears Allah the most and thus he cannot lie intentionally, in the same manner that Abubakar, Umar and Uthman fears Allah the most and thus they cannot lie intentionally. This, although the person who is arguing with the verse is informed that, you did not mention a proof to show that telling lies is an evil act (Rijs) and since he did not prove that, then removal of evil did not entailed protection from telling lies even once. If we assumed that evil has been removed and this is what he is trying to prove with the Qur'an; while there is nothing in the Qur'an which showed that evil has been removed and there is nothing to

show that lies and mistakes are evil; and there is nothing to prove that Ali has said so. We presumed all these supposing that some of what they have said is sound, but nothing of it is sound but with premises that are not in the Qur'an. Therefore, where is the proof of the leadership of Ali from the Qur'an? Who can make this type of claim other than men of disgrace, humiliation and regret (in this world and the Hereafter)?

SEGMENT: NEGEATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT LEADERSHIP OF ALI IS PROVED BY THE VERSE ON HOUSE OF ALLAH

The Rafidi stated: “The sixth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘In houses, which Allah has ordered to be raised (to be cleaned, and to be honored), in them His Name is glorified in the mornings and in the afternoons or the evenings, Men whom neither trade nor sale diverts them from the Remembrance of Allah (with heart and tongue), nor from performing AsSalat (Iqamat-as-Salat), nor from giving the Zakat. They fear a Day when hearts and eyes will be overturned (from the horror of the torment of the Day of Resurrection)’ (24:36-37).** Tha’alabi reported with its chain of narrators on the authority of Anas bin Malik and Buraidah, who said: The Prophet (s.a.w) recited this verse and a man stood up and said: ‘Which are those houses! O Messenger of Allah?’ He replied: ‘Houses of the Prophets.’ Abubakar stood to him and said: ‘O Messenger of Allah is this house among them?’ He means the house of Ali and Fatima. He replied: ‘Yes, it is among the best (houses of the Prophets) because of the men that has been described in it, which showed that they are the best. Therefore, Ali is the leader, otherwise that will entail preferring the inferior over the superior.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives: Firstly: We demand the soundness of this hadith. The mere ascribing to Tha’alabi is not a proof by the consensus of Ahlus Sunnah and Shia and not every hadith that has been narrated by anybody from among the Ahlus Sunnah become a proof for the Ahlus Sunnah. Nay, Ahlus Sunnah agreed upon the fact that what has been recorded by Tha’alabi and those who are similar to him cannot be accepted (automatically) as evidence, neither on the virtues of Abubakar and Umar, nor on proving any religious precept except if its soundness has been verified by the laid down principles. Therefore, they shall not say: We are forwarding proofs to you from the narrations that has been recorded by one of you (Ahlus Sunnah). Did the scholars of

Ahlus Sunnah ever say, whoever among them who testify on an issue is reliable and just? Or did any of their scholars say; whatever is narrated from anybody among them is sound?

Really, scholars of Ahlus Sunnah have agreed upon the fact that Tha'alabi and those similar to him are recording both the sound, the weak and the fabricated hadiths, and they agreed upon the fact that a mere narration of a hadith does not make accepting it obligatory and that is why they call Tha'alabi and those similar to him as; "night wood gatherers." He is a person who record whatever he come across whether it is sound or fabricated. Most of the hadiths that are recorded by Tha'alabi in his exegesis of the Qur'an are sound and it also contained a lot of lied, fabricated hadiths by the consensus of scholars.

Secondly: This hadith is fabricated by the verdict of scholars of hadith and its sciences and that is why they did not mention it in reliable books of hadith, such as the Sunan and the Masanid which contained some weak and fabricated hadiths in very limited proportion. The fact that this hadith is fabricated is very clear to those scholars, to the extent that they cannot even attempt to record it.

Thirdly: All scholars have agreed upon the fact that verse is talking about mosques as Allah the Most High has said: **"In houses, which Allah has ordered to be raised (to be cleaned, and to be honored), in them His Name is glorified in the mornings and in the afternoons or the evenings, Men whom neither trade nor sale diverts them from the Remembrance of Allah (with heart and tongue), nor from performing AsSalat (Iqamat-as-Salat), nor from giving the Zakat. They fear a Day when hearts and eyes will be overturned (from the horror of the torment of the Day of Resurrection)" (24:36-37).** The house of Ali and all other houses are not described with these characteristics.

Fourthly: The house of the Prophet (s.a.w) is better than the house of Ali by the consensus of all Muslims. Despite this fact it is not encompassed by this verse, because there are no men in his house, for he is the only man among his wives. When Allah spoke about the

Prophet (s.a.w) He said: **“O you who believe! Enter not the Prophet’s houses...” (33:53).** And He also said: **“And remember (O you the members of the Prophet's family, the Graces of your Lord), that which is recited in your houses of the Verses of Allah and AlHikmah (i.e. Prophet's Sunnah legal ways, etc. so give your thanks to Allah and glorify His Praises for this Quran and the Sunnah). Verily, Allah is Ever Most Courteous, Well-Acquainted with all things” (33:34).**

Fifthly: His words: “It is the houses of the Prophets,” is a clear lie against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). If this statement is correct, all believers will have no share in it. The words of Allah: **“In houses, which Allah has ordered to be raised (to be cleaned, and to be honored), in them His Name is glorified in the mornings and in the afternoons or the evenings, Men whom neither trade nor sale diverts them from the Remembrance of Allah (with heart and tongue), nor from performing AsSalat (Iqamat-as-Salat), nor from giving the Zakat. They fear a Day when hearts and eyes will be overturned (from the horror of the torment of the Day of Resurrection)” (24:36-37).** Thus, whoever has these characteristics is encompassed by these verses.

Sixthly: The words of Allah: **In houses, which Allah has ordered to be raised...” (24:36),** is an indefinite noun that has not been specified. His words the Most High: **“...which Allah has ordered to be raised (to be cleaned, and to be honored), in them His Name is glorified...” (24:36).** If He means by that acts of devotions to Him that are not exclusive to Mosques, such as prayers and remembrance of Allah, which are carried out at homes. Then this verse encompasses most of the homes of believers in which those acts are carried out and thus, it is not exclusive to the houses of the Prophets. And if Allah intended by the verse, acts that are specific to mosques which involved remembrance of Allah in the five daily obligatory prayers and other acts of devotion. Then such acts are exclusive to mosques and houses of the Prophet do not possess the special characteristics of mosques although they have their excellence by the virtue of Prophets living in them.

Seventhly: If it is intended by the “houses of Prophets,” places where Prophets live; then there is no houses of Prophets in Madina other than the homes of his wives and thus, the house of Ali cannot be included among them. And if it is intended by that, the places where Prophets entered, then it shall be known that the Prophet (s.a.w) has entered many homes of his companions. Whatever is assumed as the meaning of the mentioned (fabricated) hadith, there is no way one can exclusively add the house of Ali among the houses of Prophets without adding the houses of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and other companions. Thus, it is not exclusive in mention. With regard to the word “men,” mentioned in the verse; it is also an indefinite noun that is shared by him and other people.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF LOVING FOR KINSHIP IS ON THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The seventh evidence: The word of Allah: ‘... **Say (O Muhammad): ‘No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you...’ (42:23).** Ahmad bin Hanbal has recorded in his Musnad on the authority of Ibn Abbas who said: When the verse ‘... **Say (O Muhammad SAW): ‘No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you...’ (42:23),** was revealed the companions asked: ‘O Messenger of Allah! Who are your kinship, whose loving is obligatory upon us? He replied; ‘Ali, Fatima and their children.’ The same hadith is in Tha’alabi’s exegesis of the Qur’an and a similar hadith is in Sahihain (Bukhari and Muslim). It is not compulsory to love other than Ali among the companions, it is also not compulsory to love the three (Abubakar, Umar and Uthman). Therefore, Ali is the best among them and hence he shall be the leader, because differing with him nullifies love and obeying him entailed loving him and thus obeying him is obligatory and this is what is meant by leadership.”

We say: Reply to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand the soundness of this hadith to be proven. His claim that: “Ahmad bin Hanbal has recorded it in his Musnad,” is a clear lie, for surely, Musnad of Ahmad is here with us and there are millions copies of that book, but it does not contain this hadith. What is a clearer lie is his statement: “And similar hadith is in the Sahihain,” and it is not in the Sahihain. What is in the Sahihain and Musnad Ahmad contradicted his claims. Surely this man and those similar to him are ignorant of the books of scholars (of hadith), they do not read it and they do not know what it contained.

Secondly: This hadith is a lied fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith and they are the authority in this science. This hadith is not in any book of hadith that is referred to (for knowledge of the hadith of the Prophet).

Thirdly: This verse is in Chapter 42 (Shurah – Consultation) of the Qur'an and it is a Makkan Chapter - it was revealed in Makka) by the consensus of scholars of Ahlus Sunnah. Nay, all the Chapters that begin with Ha Min (حم) and Ta Sin (طس) are revealed in Makka. It is well known that Ali married Fatima in Madina after the battle of Badr, Hasan was born in the third year after immigration, and Husain was born in the fourth year after immigration. Therefore, this verse was revealed many years before the existence of Hasan and Husain. Then, how can the Prophet (s.a.w) interpret the verse on the obligation of loving kinship that is unknown and has not been created?

Fourthly: Interpretation of the verse has been recorded in the Sahihain on the authority of Ibn Abbas contradicting what he (the Rafidi) has stated. It was reported by Said bin Jubair that Ibn Abbas was asked concerning the words of Allah: **"... Say (O Muhammad): 'No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you'" (42:23), Sa'id bin Jubayr said, "To be kind to the family of Muhammad." Ibn `Abbas said, "No, you have jumped to a hasty conclusion. There was no clan among Quraish to whom the Prophet did not have some ties of kinship." Ibn `Abbas said, "Except that you uphold the ties of kinship that exist between me and you" (Bukhari, Ahmad).** These are the words of Ibn Abbas, he is the exegetist of the Qur'an and the most learned scholar among the Prophet's household after Ali. He is saying that, its meaning is not to love the kinship, but means that: O Arabs! O Quraish! I am not asking you for recompense, but I am asking you to join the kinship relation that is between you and me. Thus he is asking those he was sent to them as a prophet to join their relation of kith and kin with him and that they shall not commit aggression against him, so that he can be able to convey the message of his Lord (peacefully).

Fifthly: He said; **"No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you" (42:23).** He did not say "except loving for kinship," and he did not say, "except my kinship." If

he want to say loving his kinship, he would have said, “except loving my relatives.”^[169]

Sixthly: We say: The prophet (s.a.w) never ask to be paid or to be recompensed for conveying the Message of his Lord, nay his recompense is with Allah the Most High as He the Most Exalted stated: **“Say (O Muhammad): ‘No wage do I ask of you for this (the Quran), nor am I one of the Mutakallifun (those who pretend and fabricate things which do not exist)’” (38:86).** And His words the Most Exalted: **“Or is it that you (O Muhammad) ask a wage from them (for your preaching of Islamic Monotheism) so that they are burdened with a load of debt? (52:40).** And He said in another verse: **“Say (O Muhammad): “Whatever wage I might have asked of you is yours. My wage is from Allah only. And He is Witness over all things” (34:47).** But the exclusion here is disjoined in the like manner it appeared in another verse: **“Say: “No reward do I ask of you for this (that which I have brought from my Lord and its preaching, etc.), save that whosoever wills, may take a Path to his Lord” (25:57).**

Surely, loving family of the Prophet (s.a.w) is obligatory, but its obligation is not proven by this verse and there is nothing in it to prove that loving them is recompense (repayment) to him. Nay, loving them is among the acts of devotion that Allah has made obligatory upon His slaves. Therefore, whoever made loving the Prophet’s family as a form of recompense to him has made a great mistake. If it is recompense for him, he will not be recompensed by Allah for doing it, because we are paying him what he deserved for conveying the Message of Allah to us. Can any Muslim make such a statement?

Seventhly: The word, “the kinship (القربى)” has the definite article “the” (alif and lam) added to it, which showed that all those who have been addressed; those who he was commanded to say to them: **“No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you” (42:23),** knew the meaning of the verse and those who it mean by “the kinship (القربى).”

With regard to his words: “It is not compulsory to love other than Ali among the companions, it is also not compulsory to love the three (Abubakar, Umar and Uthman).” We say: This statement is rejected. Nay, it is compulsory to love them, befriend them and support them, for it has been established that Allah love them and it is compulsory upon us to love whoever is loved by Allah. Surely, loving for the sake of Allah and hating for the sake of Allah is compulsory and it is the strongest bond of faith, furthermore, they are the chiefs, pious friends of Allah. Allah has made loving them obligatory, nay it has been established by the texts of Qur’an that Allah is pleased with them and they with Him and whoever Allah is pleased with; He surely love him.

What we aimed to say about his words: “It is not compulsory to love other than Ali among the companions, it is also not compulsory to love the three (Abubakar, Umar and Uthman),” is that it is a false statement to Ahlus Sunnah. Nay, loving those three is more obligatory to them than loving Ali, because the obligation to love is in accordance to measure of virtues and thus, whoever is the best, loving him is more perfect (and more deserved).

With regard to his words: “... because differing with him nullifies loving him and obeying him entailed loving him, and this is what is meant by leadership.”

Answer to the above is from many angles among which are: If love made obedience obligatory, then it is obligatory to love all the Prophet’s family members and relatives and thus, obeying all of them is obligatory; it is also obligatory that Fatima become an Imam (leader with power and authority). If this submission is false; then, all similar claims are also false.

Furthermore, certainly, when love is made obligatory it does not entail leadership; the person whose love is obligatory did not automatically become the leader and this is proven by the fact that it is obligatory to love Hasan and Husain before they become leaders. It is obligatory to love Ali during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he is not the leader. Nay, loving him is obligatory even though he did not become the leader until after the murder of Uthman.

Those people (Shia Rafidah) with the Ahlus Sunnah are similar to Christians with Muslims. The Christians have turned Jesus (a.s) in to a god and they made Prophets Abraham (a.s), Moses (a.s) and Muhammad (s.a.w) lesser than his (Jesus) companions. The Shia Rafidah have turned Ali into an infallible leader or a prophet or a god^[170] and the three Caliph are lesser than Ashtar an-Nakh'i and those who are similar to him among those who fought on his side. This is why their ignorance and injustice are beyond descriptions. They believe in holding tightly to fabricated narrations, ambiguous phrases and false analogies, while they reject sound concurrent hadith narrations, clear texts and plain very clear rational evidences.

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF SACRIFICING THE SELF FOR ALLAH PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The eighth evidence: The words of Allah: **“And of mankind is he who would sell himself, seeking the Pleasure of Allah. And Allah is full of Kindness to (His) slaves” (2:207).**

Tha’alabi stated: When the Prophet (s.a.w) decided to immigrate to Madina, he left Ali in Makka so that he can repay his debts and return to people what they delivered to him for safe keeping. He also commanded him to sleep on his bed in the night he left for the cave, while the polytheists have encircled his house. He said to him: ‘O Ali! Cover yourself with my green blanket and sleep on my bed. Surely, nothing evil will come to you from their side, by the Will of Allah. He did that and Allah the Most High revealed to Angels Gabriel and Mikha’il: I have made you into brothers and made the age of one of you longer than that of the other. Who among you will prefer his brother with longer life? Both of them chose long life. Allah revealed to them: ‘Why don’t you behave like Ali bin Abi Talib, I made him brother to Muhammad (s.a.w) and he slept on his bed, sacrificing himself for him and preferring him to live. Go down to the earth and protect him from his enemies.’ They come down, Gabriel stood before his head while Mikha’il stood before his legs. Gabriel said: ‘Excellent, well done, who is like you O Ibn Abi Talib; Allah and His Angels are proud of you! At that moment, Allah revealed to His Prophet (s.a.w) while he is on his way to Madina, concerning Ali: **“And of mankind is he who would sell himself, seeking the Pleasure of Allah. And Allah is full of Kindness to (His) slaves” (2:207).** Ibn Abbas said: ‘It was revealed concerning Ali, when the Prophet (s.a.w) escaped from the polytheists and hid in the cave.’ This outstanding trait has not occurred to anyone else and it proved that he is better than all the companions and therefore he is the leader.”

We reply to the above from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration to be proven. The mere recording of a hadith by Tha'alabi and men similar to him; nay their narrations are not evidence by the consensus of both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. This is a Mursal hadith (a hadith that is narrated by a Tabi'i and not a companion and ascribed it to the Prophet) and he did not mention its chain of authority. He transmitted it as a form of Israiliyyat (stories from people of the book) and Islamiyyat (Islamic fairy tales) and those are things that are known to be false, although he (Tha'alabi) did not intend to lie intentionally.

Secondly: This narration is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith and history and they are the authorities on this type of issue.

Thirdly: When the Prophet (s.a.w) and Abubakar immigrated to Madina, the polytheist of Makka did not have any aim in seeking for Ali. The people they are looking for are the prophet (s.a.w) and Abubakar and they offered rewards for anybody who can bring anyone of them (dead or alive), as has been transmitted in sound hadith of Bukhari and the scholars of hadith have no doubt about its soundness.^[171] The prophet (s.a.w) left Ali on his bed, so that they will be thinking that he is in his house and thus, they cannot go after him. In the morning they found Ali, their hope was dashed and they did not harm him. They just asked him about the Prophet (s.a.w) and he told them that he does not know where he is. Nobody has any fear that somebody will harm Ali, for the fear is for the Prophet and Abubakar as-Siddiq. If they have any evil intension against Ali, they would have harmed him when they found him and because they did not harm him when they found him, it showed that they are neither looking for him nor seeking to harm him. Therefore, where is the self-sacrifice?

Undoubtedly, the person who was sacrificing himself is the one who is willing to defend him by person, so that any evil aimed at Prophet (s.a.w) will befall him rather than the Prophet (s.a.w), is Abubakar. While they are moving towards Madina, he will remember those who are pursuing them and he will immediately move behind the Prophet (s.a.w), when he remembered those who may be laying an ambush,

he will immediately move forward. He used to go and spy for information and if there is anything that is feared, he preferred it to befall him rather than the Prophet (s.a.w).^[172]

Many Prophet's companions have sacrificed themselves for him in many battlefields; some of them have been killed before him, while defending him and some had their hands paralyzed, such as Talha bin Ubaidullah.^[173] Now, this is an obligation upon all believers and if it assumed that Ali has sacrificed himself for the Prophet (s.a.w); then, this is a virtue which he shared with many companions. Then, how about if there is no any fear (for any harm that will befall him for sleeping on the Prophet's bed)?

Furthermore, the (fabricated) hadith stated that the prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali: "O Ali! Cover yourself with my green blanket and sleep on my bed. Surely nothing evil will come to you from their side, by the Will of Allah." Thus, he promised him and he is the truthful, that nothing evil will befall him and thus, he has rest of mind by the promise of the Prophet (s.a.w).

Fourthly: That this hadith is a fabricated lie is self-evident, for surely the Angels cannot be addressed with this type of falsehood and remarks that are unsuitable to them; because none of them is hungry so that he can give preference to his brother and they do not fear anything, so that one can prefer the others safety over himself. Therefore, how can Allah address them saying: "Who among you prefer his brother with long life? There is absolutely nothing called making brotherhood between the Angels. Nay, Angel Gabriel has special duties that he carries out without the aid of Mikha'il and Mikha'il has duties that he discharges without the aid of Gabriel. It come in sound hadith that revelation and aid are the duties of Gabriel while the duties of Mikha'il are rainfall and sustenance.

Fifthly: The Prophet (s.a.w) did not make any bond of brotherhood with Ali or any other person. Nay, whatever is narrated on this issue is lie and fabrication. This hadith of his making brotherhood with Ali – with all its weakness and falsity – is taking about taking him as his brother in Madina (and not in Makka). This is how Tirmidhi narrated it. Therefore, the stories of making bond of brotherhood (between Ali

and the Prophet) in Makka or in Madina are false. Furthermore, it is well known that, his sleeping on the bed of the Prophet (s.a.w) in the night of his immigration to Madina is not self-sacrifice by the consensus of scholars.

Sixthly: That Angels Gabriel and Mikha'il to come down from Heavens in order to protect the life of one person is one of the greatest detestable things, for surely Allah can protect the life of whoever He Wills among His servants without need for this act. It was narrated that they come down on the day of the battle of Badr for fighting and on similar grand events. If they ever come down to protect the life of an individual, they would have come down to protect the life of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his companion (Abubakar as-Siddiq), who are being chased and pursued by the enemies from all fronts. They have placed rewards on the head of each one of them and they are towards them stern and severe with darkened hearts.

Seventhly: This verse is in the second Chapter of the Qur'an and it was revealed in Madina by consensus of scholars. It was revealed after the Prophet (s.a.w) has immigrated to Madina and not during the immigration (on the way to Madina). It was reported that when Suhaib^[174] migrated to Madina and the polytheists intercepted him on the way. He gave them all his wealth and then arrived at Madina. The Prophet said to him: ***"The sell has yielded profit, O Abu Yahya!"*** This is a well-known story in the books of exegesis of the Qur'an and it has been mentioned by many scholars.

Eighthly: The Rafidi stated: "This outstanding trait has not occurred to anyone else and it proved that he is better than all the companions and therefore he is the leader."

We reply that: Undoubtedly, the virtues and outstanding works that was done by Abubakar during the immigration of the Prophet (s.a.w) to Madina has not been attained by any of the companions and this has been proven by the text of the Qur'an, Sunnah and consensus of the Muslim scholars. Therefore, this is a confirmed precedence and virtue which has been confirmed on his right to the exclusion of Umar, Uthman, Ali and all other companions. And thus he is the

leader. This is a sound proof that contained no falsehood, for Allah the Most High said: **“If you help him (Muhammad) not (it does not matter), for Allah did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out, the second of two, when they (Muhammad and Abubakar) were in the cave, and he (S.A.W) said to his companion (Abubakar): ‘Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us.’ Then Allah sent down His Sakinah (calmness, tranquility, peace, etc.) upon him, and strengthened him with forces (angels) which you saw not, and made the word of those who disbelieved the lowermost, while it was the Word of Allah that became the uppermost, and Allah is All-Mighty, All-Wise” (9:40).** Absolutely this type of virtue has not been attained by anybody except Abubakar, in contrast to defending the Prophet (s.a.w) with one’s body, soul and life, - which if it is true – many of the companions have protected and defended the Prophet (s.a.w) with their bodies (and souls). This is an obligation upon all believers and it is not an exclusive virtue of the grand companions.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSES OF MUTUAL IMPRECATION PROVE THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The ninth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘Then whoever disputes with you concerning him (Jesus) after (all this) knowledge that has come to you, (i.e. Jesus) being a slave of Allah, and having no share in Divinity) say: (O Muhammad) ‘Come, let us call our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves - then we pray and invoke (sincerely) the Curse of Allah upon those who lie’ (3:61).** All scholars of Ahlus Sunnah have transmitted that ‘Our sons,’ means Hasan and Husain, ‘our women,’ mean Fatima, and ‘ourselves,’ means Ali, because Allah the Most High has made him soul of the Prophet, but oneness is impossible and thus, what is intended is that he is equal to him. To the Prophet (s.a.w) belongs the general authority and the same can be said with regard to the person equal to him. In addition to that, if there are some people who are equal to them and better than them on acceptance of prayers Allah will have commanded him to take them with him, because he is in a situation of need. Thus, if they are the best, their leadership has been established.

The plea of this verse cannot be hidden to anyone except the person who has been overtaken and controlled by Satan; he has taken all parts of his heart, love of the world is made fair seeming to him and he cannot attain it until he prevents the rightful owners from their rights.”

We reply as follows: Firstly: Taking Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain for mutual imprecation is a sound hadith that has been recorded by Muslim on the authority of Sa’ad bin Abi Waqqas. He stated in a long hadith, when this verse was revealed: **“Then whoever disputes with you concerning him (Jesus) after (all this) knowledge that has come to you, (i.e. Jesus) being a slave of Allah, and having no share in Divinity) say: (O Muhammad) ‘Come, let us call our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves**

and yourselves - then we pray and invoke (sincerely) the Curse of Allah upon those who lie” (3:61). The Prophet (s.a.w) invited Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain and said: **“O Allah those are my family” (Muslim).** But this neither proves leadership nor precedence (or being the best).

With regard to the words of the Rafidi: “Allah the Most High has made him soul of the Prophet, but oneness is impossible and thus, what is intended is that he is equal to him. To the Prophet (s.a.w) belongs the general authority and the same can be said with regard to the person equal to him.”

We reply that: We do not accept that nothing remains but equality and there is nothing to prove that claim. Nay, stating that it is the intended purpose is rejected because nobody is equal to the Prophet (s.a.w), neither Ali nor anyone else.

This word does not mean or entail comparison or equality in the Arabic language. Allah has said in the story of slander (against Aisha): **“Why did not the believers - men and women - when ye heard of the affair,- put the best construction on it in their own minds and say, ‘This (charge) is an obvious lie?’” (24:12).** This did not make believing men and believing women equal and mutual imprecation customarily take place with the closest relatives, otherwise if it take place with the farthest kinship even if they are the best people to Allah, the goal will not be achieved; what is required is that they invite their closest relatives and he invite his closest relatives.

With regard to the statement of the Rafidi: “If there are some people who are equal to them and better than them on acceptance of prayers Allah will have commanded him to take them with him, because he is in a situation of need.”

We reply that: The aim is not acceptance of supplications for if that is the case, the prayer of the Prophet (s.a.w) alone is enough. If the aim of inviting people with him is acceptance of supplication, he will have invited all the believers and supplicated with them, in the like manner that he used to pray for rain together with them and in the

same manner he used to supplicate with the poor Muhajirun and he will say: ***“You are only aided and sustained due to the weak ones among you! With their supplications, prayers, and sincerity.”***

It is well known that – although the prayers of those invited are acceptable to Allah – making much supplication is the best in making Allah accept Prayers. The aim is not to invite those whose prayers are acceptable to Allah, nay they are invited for a contest between a family and a family. We knew out of necessity that if the Prophet (s.a.w) invited Abubakar, Umar, Uthman, Talh, Zubair, Ibn Mas’ud, Ubay bin Ka’ab, Mu’az bin Jabal and others for oaths of imprecation, they are the greatest people to respond to his commands and the prayer of those people and those similar to them is the most accepted prayers. But Allah did not command him to take them with him because the aim cannot be achieved by going with them. The aim is that those people shall come with those they feel concern and anxiety towards them, such as their children, women and men who are very close to them. If the Prophet (s.a.w) invited those who are foreigners to him, those people will also invite those who are foreigners to them and they will not feel the fear of the consequences of the mutual imprecation upon those foreigners, in the same manner that they will fear for its consequences upon their closest family members. Certainly human disposition inclines towards fearing evil consequences upon his close relatives than upon foreigners. Thus, Allah commanded the Prophet (s.a.w) to invite his closest relatives and those people to invite their closest relatives for the oath.

It is thus established that the verse, absolutely does not prove the contention of the Rafidi, but he and people who are similar to him, whose hearts contained deviation from the right path and the truth such as the Christians; they hold tightly to general expressions and shun distinct, unambiguous texts. Thereafter you see him disparaging the best of the Islamic community with false claims when he contended that the meaning of “ourselves,” is those who are equal and this has contradicted the way it is used in the Arabic language. What makes this point clearer is that the words of Allah as

stated by the Prophet (s.a.w): “Our women(انساءن),” is not exclusive to Fatima. Nay, whoever he invited among his daughters is qualified by that verse just like Fatima, but at that time only Fatima is alive for Ruqayyah, Umm Kulthum and Zainab have died. Similarly the word: “ourselves(الأنفسن),” is not exclusive to Ali for this is a plural form, in the like manner that ‘Our women,” is a plural form and “our children(الأبناءن),” also is a plural form. He invited Hasan and Husain because there is nobody who has a father and child relation with him other them.

SEGMENT: NEGATION OF THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ADAM RECEIVING WORDS FROM HIS LORD PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The tenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most high: **“Then Adam received from his Lord Words. And his Lord pardoned him (accepted his repentance). Verily, He is the One Who forgives (accepts repentance), the Most Merciful” (2:37).** Faqih Ibn Maghazili narrated with its chain of authority to Ibn Abbas, who said: ‘The prophet was asked concerning the words that Adam received from his Lord and was forgiven. He replied: ‘He asked him by the right of Muhammad, Ali, Fatima, Hasan, and Husain to forgive him and He forgave him.’ Nobody among the companions attains this virtue other than Ali and therefore, he is the leader. And because he was made equal to the Prophet (s.a.w) in the plea with him to Allah.”

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We request for the soundness of this hadith to be proven. It is already known that the mere narration of Ibn Maghazili did not allow its use as a proof by the consensus of scholar of hadith.

Secondly: This hadith is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Abu Faraj Ibn Jauzi has recorded it among fabricated hadith in his book on fabricated hadiths (al-Maudu’at).

Thirdly: The words that Adam (a.s) received from his Lord has been explained in the Qur’an by the words of Allah the Most Exalted: **“They said: ‘Our Lord! We have wronged ourselves. If You forgive us not, and bestow not upon us Your Mercy, we shall certainly be of the losers” (7:23).** Similar hadiths has been narrated from the predecessors and there is nothing that they mentioned of swearing (with any human being) in any sound hadith.

Fourthly: It is well known out of necessity (in the religion of Islam) that those who are lesser than Adam (a.s) among the unbelievers

and the profligates, if one of them repent to Allah, He will accept his repentance even if he did not swear to Him with anybody. Then, why shall Adam (a.s) require for his repentance to Allah what is not required by any sinner; neither a believer nor unbeliever?

Fifthly: The prophet (s.a.w) never ask anybody to use this type of supplication while seeking for forgiveness. Nay he never commands anybody to do this type of supplication or anything similar to it. Nay, he never commands his community to swear to Allah with any created being. If this supplication is lawful, he will have commanded his community to do it.

Sixthly: Swearing to Allah with Angels and Prophets is an issue that is neither commanded by Allah, nor the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w). Nay, many scholars and jurists – such as Abu Hanifa, and Abu Yusuf etc., - have stated that it is not allowed to swear to Allah with a created being. This has been explained in another place in details.

Seventhly: If doing so is legal, it is well known that Adam (a.s) is an honored Prophet. How can he swear to Allah with someone who is lesser than him? Certainly, our Prophet (s.a.w) is better than Adam (a.s), but he is better than Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF LEADERSHIP PROVES SUCESSORSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The eleventh evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘And (remember) when the Lord of Ibrahim (Abraham) [i.e., Allah] tried him with (certain) Commands, which he fulfilled. He (Allah) said (to him), ‘Verily, I am going to make you a leader (Prophet) of mankind.’ [Ibrahim (Abraham)] said, ‘And of my offspring (to make leaders).’ (Allah) said, ‘My Covenant (Prophethood, etc.) includes not Zalimun (polytheists and wrong-doers)’ (2:124).** Faqih Ibn Maghazili narrated on the authority of Ibn Mas’ud who said, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘This supplication terminated with me and Ali, and none of us has ever bowed to an idol, thus He took me as a Prophet and He took Ali as a legatee.’ This is a proof on this issue.”

Reply to the above contention is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand that the soundness of the hadith shall be proven.

Secondly: This hadith is a fabricated lie by the consensus of the scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: concerning statement of the Rafidi: “This supplication terminated with me and Ali.” We reply that: This statement shall not be ascribed to the Prophet (s.a.w), because if it means that: It did not affect those before us; it is rejected because there have been many Prophet’s from the progeny of Abraham (a.s) who have been encompassed by the supplication. If he mean by that: The supplication terminated with us: There is no any leader after us; it entailed that Hasan, Husain and other than them are not leaders and this is false by the consensus of scholars. Advancing argument with the justification that he has never prostrated to idol is untenable because this factor exist among all Muslims after them (who are born in Islam).

Fourthly: The virtue of never bowing to an idol is being shared by all those who are born Muslims, although the first and foremost to embrace Islam are better than them. How can he (the Prophet) give the inferior this status over the superior?

Fifthly: If it is said he never bow to an idol; this is because he did not reach the age of legal responsibility (puberty – in the period before Islam) and he did not bow to it after he embraced Islam. This is the case with every Muslim and a child is not under legal obligation. If it is said: He did not bow (to an idol) before he embrace Islam. We reply that: This negation is not established (proven) and the one who claimed it is not reliable.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BESTOWING LOVE PROVES THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twelfth evidence: the words of Allah: **‘Verily, those who believe [in the Oneness of Allah and in His Messenger (Muhammad) and work deeds of righteousness, the Most Beneficent (Allah) will bestow love for them (in the hearts of the believers)]’ (19:96)**. Hafiz Abu Nu’aim al-Isfahani narrated with its chain of authority to Ibn Abbas, who said: ‘It was revealed concerning Ali, and love here means; Allah will put his love in the hearts of the believers.’ It come in Tha’alab’s exegesis of the Qur’an from Barra bin Azib, who said, the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali: ‘O Ali! Say, O Allah make for me from Yourself a covenant, and put my love in the hearts of the believers.’ At that moment, Allah revealed: **‘Verily, those who believe [in the Oneness of Allah and in His Messenger (Muhammad) and work deeds of righteousness, the Most Beneficent (Allah) will bestow love for them (in the hearts of the believers)]’ (19:96)**. Similar virtue has not been established to other than him and therefore, he shall be the leader.”

The answer to the above is from many angles: Firstly: It is obligatory to establish the soundness of a hadith otherwise advancing it as a proof on insubstantial premises is false by the consensus of scholars. It is a form of speaking without knowledge, following things without knowledge and arguing without knowledge. Mere ascription of hadith does not imply soundness by the consensus of scholars of both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia.

Secondly: Those two hadiths are fabricated lies by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: The words of Allah: “... **Those who believe and work deed of righteousness...**” (19:96), is a general statement encompassing all believers and therefore, restricting it to Ali is untenable and prohibited. Nay, it encompasses Ali and other believers. [\[175\]](#)

This contention is proven by the fact that Hasan, Husain, and other believers that are honored by Shia are encompassed by the verse; by this consensus has been established on its being general and that it is not restricted to Ali.

The words of the Rafidi that: "Similar virtues has not been established for other than him (among the companions)," is absolutely rejected as already explained. Surely, they are the best century and therefore they are the best of those who believe and do righteous deeds than all other centuries.

Fourthly: Allah has informed that He will make those who believe and do righteous deed beloved in the hearts of His creation and this is a promise from Him. It is well-known that Allah has placed the love of the Prophet's companions in the heart of every Muslim, especially the love of the rightly guided Caliphs and especially Abubakar and Umar, for surely all the Prophet's companions loves them and they are the best generation.

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THE WARNER PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The thirteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘And the disbelievers say: ‘Why is not a sign sent down to him from his Lord?’ You are only a warner, and to every people there is a guide’ (13:6).** From the book titled ‘al-Firdaus’ Ibn Abbas said, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘I am the warner and Ali is the guide. O Ali, those who attain guidance will be guided by you.’ There are similar hadiths that has been narrated by Abu Nu’aim and it is unambiguous on establishing the leadership, power and authority of Ali.”

We reply to the above from many perspectives:

Firstly: The soundness of this hadith has not been proven and thus advancing it as an evidence is not allowed. The book al-Firdaus by al-Dailami contained a lot of fabricated hadiths and thus, the scholars of hadith have agreed that the mere narration of a hadith by him does not make it sound, the same is being applied to what has been narrated by Abu Nu’aim; its soundness has not been proven because he has narrated it.

Secondly: This is a lied fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith and thus, it is obligatory to adjudge it spurious and reject it.

Thirdly: It is not permitted to ascribe this type of statement to the Prophet (s.a.w): “I am the warner. O Ali those who are guided will be guided by you,” apparently entailed that people will be guided by you and not by me. A Muslim cannot make this statement, for it is distinct that warning and guidance has been divided between them; this is a warner who do not guide anyone and that is a guide (who does not warn anybody). A Muslim cannot make this statement.

Fourthly: Undoubtedly, Allah the Most High has made Muhammad (s.a.w) a guide, He said: **“And thus We have sent to you (O**

Muhammad) Ruhan (an Inspiration, and a Mercy) of Our Command. You knew not what is the Book, nor what is Faith? But We have made it (this Quran) a light wherewith We guide whosoever of Our slaves We will. And verily, you (O Muhammad) are indeed guiding (mankind) to the Straight Path (i.e. Allah's religion of Islamic Monotheism). The Path of Allah, to Whom belongs all that is in the heavens and all that is in the earth. Verily, all the matters at the end go to Allah (for decision)” (42:52-53). Then, how can they make a guide the one who has not been described as such by Allah and deny the attribute from the one who has been described by it and with it?

Fifthly: The fabricated, spurious hadith stated: “With you those who are guided will attain guidance.” It is apparently stating whoever is guided in the community of Muhammad (s.a.w) is guided by Ali and this is a clear lie. Surely a lot of people have believed in the Prophet (s.a.w) and they entered Paradise and they never heard from Ali even one word and most of those who believe in the Prophet (s.a.w) and are guided by him did not receive any guidance from Ali. Furthermore, when countries have been conquered, people embraced Islam, believe, and become guided through the companions who immigrated and live in those countries (and later on by the students of those companions) and those believers never heard anything from Ali. Then, how is it permitted to say: Those who are guided attain guidance through you?^[176]

Sixthly: It is said that the meaning of the verse is: “You are only a warner and to every people there is a guide; and He is Allah the Most high.” This is a weak interpretation. Another weak interpretation is there statement: “You are the warner and the guide to all people.” The sound interpretation is: You are surely a warner and many warners have passed away before you and every nation has a warner guiding them – meaning: Who is inviting them to guidance. This is similar to the words of Allah: **“Verily! We have sent you with the truth, a bearer of glad tidings, and a warner. And there never was a nation but a warner had passed among them” (35:23).** This is the interpretation of a number of exegetist of the Qur’an, such

as Qatadah, Ikrimah, Abi Dhuha and Abdurrahman bin Zaid. Interpreting it with Ali as the sole guide is false, because Allah said: **“And the disbelievers say: ‘Why is not a sign sent down to him from his Lord?’ You are only a warner, and to every people there is a guide” (13:7).** This entailed that the one guiding these people is not the one guiding those people and hence guides will be numerous. How can Ali be the guide to all people from the first to the last?

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF QUESTIONING PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated “The fourteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘But stop them, verily they are to be questioned’ (37:23)**. From Abu Nu’aim and from Sh’abi, both of them reported from Ibn Abbas who said regarding the words of Allah: **‘But stop them, verily they are to be questioned,’ (37:23)** concerning the leadership of Ali. It was also narrated in the book al-Firdaus, on the authority of Sa’id al-Khudri that the Prophet (s.a.w) said so. If people are asked in the Hereafter concerning the leadership of Ali, it entailed that establishing it is obligatory. This trait is not established for other than him among the companions and therefore, he is the leader.”

Reply to the above is from many angles: Firstly: We demand the soundness of this narration to be proven. The mere ascription of a narration to al-Firdaus and to Abu Nu’aim does not prove anything, by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Secondly: This is a lied, fabricated, spurious hadith, by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: Undoubtedly, Allah the Most High has said in the Qur’an: **“(It will be said to the angels): ‘Assemble those who did wrong, together with their companions (from the devils) and what they used to worship. ‘Instead of Allah, and lead them on to the way of flaming Fire (Hell); ‘But stop them, verily they are to be questioned. ‘What is the matter with you? Why do you not help one another (as you used to do in the world)?’ Nay, but that Day they shall surrender” (37:22-26)**, Thus, this is an address to the polytheists, the deniers of the Last Day and those people will be questioned concerning the Oneness of Allah (Tauhid), belief in His Messenger (s.a.w) and the Last Day. Where is the relevance of Ali in questioning those people? Do you think if they love him, although they are unbelievers and polytheists, his love will benefit them? Can their hatred towards Ali be compared with their hatred towards the

Prophet of Allah (s.a.w), His Book and His religion? Nobody can interpret the Qur'an in this manner and claim this is the interpretation of the Prophet (s.a.w) except an atheist, Zindiq (a heretic characterized by an extreme religious infidelity to Islam), who is playing with religion, disparaging the religion of Islam or an extreme ignorant man who does not know (the meaning of) what he is saying. What is the difference between loving Ali, Talha, Zubair, Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas, Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman?

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF TONE OF SPEECH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: The fifteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘Had We willed, We could have shown them to you, and you should have known them by their marks, but surely, you will know them by the tone of their speech! And Allah knows all your deeds’ (47:30)**. Abu Nu’aim narrated with its chain of authority to Abu Sa’id al-Khudri concerning the words of Allah: **‘Had We willed, We could have shown them to you, and you should have known them by their marks, but surely, you will know them by the tone of their speech! And Allah knows all your deeds’ (47:30)**. He said: It means their hatred of Ali. This virtue did not occur to anyone among the companions and therefore, he is better than them and thus, he shall be the leader.”

We reply that: Firstly: We are demanding that the soundness of this narration shall be proven.

Secondly: This is a lie against Abu Sa’id al-Khudri (r.a) by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: We say: If it has been established that Abu Sa’id al-Khudri (r.a) has made such a statement, then his mere statement as an individual from among the companions is not a proof. Whenever the statement of a companion is contradicted by the statement of another companion, it cannot be considered an evidence, by the consensus of scholars. The disparagement of Ali by many companions is well known. Furthermore, this Rafidi has promised to advance proofs on the leadership of Ali from the Book of Allah and Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w) and not from the statements of the companions.

Fourthly: We knew out of necessity that generally the tone of their speech that is identified with the hypocrites does not comprise hatred of Ali. Therefore, giving it this interpretation is a clear falsehood.

Fifthly: Undoubtedly, Ali is not greater than Umar in showing hatred against unbelievers and hypocrites. Nay, we never know that they suffer harm from him in the like manner that they suffers harm from Umar.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF FOREMOST PROVES THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated “The sixteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘And those foremost [(in Islamic Faith of Monotheism and in performing righteous deeds) in the life of this world on the very first call for to embrace Islam,] will be foremost (in Paradise). These will be those nearest to Allah’** (56:10-11). Abu Nu’aim narrated from Ibn Abbas that the foremost of the Islamic community is Ali bin Abi Talib. Ibn Maghazili narrated from Mujahid concerning the words of Allah: **“The sixteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: And those foremost [(in Islamic Faith of Monotheism and in performing righteous deeds) in the life of this world on the very first call for to embrace Islam,] will be foremost (in Paradise). These will be those nearest to Allah” (56:10-11).** He said: ‘Yusha’u bin Nun is the first to accept Moses (a.s), Moses (a.s) is the first to accept Aaron (a.s), the companion of Yasin is the first to accept Jesus (a.s) and Ali is the first to accept Muhammad (s.a.w).’ This virtue has not been attained by anybody among the companions except Ali and thus he is the leader.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand the soundness of this hadith to be proven first for there are a lot of fabricated lies in what this person and that person narrates. This is a lie against Ibn Abbas and even if it is confirmed that he has made this statement it cannot be accepted because it has been contradicted by a stronger proof.

Thirdly: Allah the Most High has said: **“And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun (those who migrated from Makkah to Al-Madinah) and the Ansar (the citizens of Al-Madinah who helped and gave aid to the Muhajirun) and also those who followed them exactly (in Faith). Allah is well-pleased with them as they are well-pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow (Paradise), to dwell therein forever. That**

is the supreme success” (9:100). And Allah said in another verse: “Then We gave the Book the Quran) for inheritance to such of Our slaves whom We chose (the followers of Muhammad SAW). Then of them are some who wrong their ownelves, and of them are some who follow a middle course, and of them are some who are, by Allah’s Leave, foremost in good deeds. That (inheritance of the Quran), that is indeed a great grace” (35:32).

The first and foremost Muslims are those who spent their wealth on the path of Allah and fought Jihad before the conquest of Makka. Those who participated in the allegiance of Ridwan under the tree are part of them and they are more than one thousand four hundred men. Then how can anybody say that the first and the foremost of the Islamic community is one man?

Fourthly: With regard to his words: “This virtue has not been attained by anybody among the companions.” This claim is absolutely rejected for people have differed on the first person to embrace Islam. It is said that Abubakar is the first person to embrace Islam and thus, he embraced Islam before Ali. It is also said that Ali embraced Islam before him, but at that time he is a child, who has not yet reached the age of legal responsibility (age of puberty), and scholars have differed on a child who embrace Islam. There is no contradictory opinion on the fact that the Islam of Abubakar is more perfect and more beneficial (as a matured man than that of Ali as child). Therefore, he is the most perfect person to first embrace Islam by the consensus of scholars. Other scholars said that: Abubakar is absolutely the first and foremost to embrace Islam. Then, how can it be said Ali embrace Islam before him without any cogent proof?

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE THOSE WHO BELIEVE AND IMMIGRATED PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The seventeenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **“Those who believed (in the Oneness of Allah - Islamic Monotheism) and emigrated and strove hard and fought in Allah's Cause with their wealth and their lives are far higher in degree with Allah. They are the successful” (9:20).** Razin bin Mu’awiyah narrated in his book al-Mujma’ah bainal Sihah as-Sittah, that it was revealed concerning Ali when Talha bin Shaibah and Abbas boasted. This virtue has not been established for other than him among the companions, therefore he is the best and thus, he shall be the leader.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives: Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration to be proven and Razin has mentioned in his book a lot of things that are not in the Sihah as-Sitta. [\[177\]](#)

Secondly: What has come in sound hadith is not as mentioned by Razin. Nay, the hadith that is sound is the one narrated by Nu'man bin Bashir who said: ***“As I was (sitting) near the pulpit of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him), a man said: I do not care if, after embracing Islam, I do not do any good deed (except) distributing drinking water among the pilgrims. Another said: I do not care if, after embracing Islam, I do not do any good deed beyond maintenance service to the Sacred Mosque. Another said: Jihad in the way of Allah is better than what you have said. 'Umar reprimanded them and said: Don't raise your voices near the pulpit of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on Friday. When prayer was over, I entered (the apartment of the Holy Prophet) and asked his verdict about the matter in which they had differed. (It was upon this that) Allah, the Almighty and Exalted, revealed the Qur'anic verse: “Do you make the giving of drinking water to the pilgrims and***

the maintenance of the Sacred Mosque equal to (the service of those) who believe in Allah and the Last Day and strive hard in the cause of Allah. They are not equal in the sight of God. And Allah guides not the wrongdoing people" (19: 20). This tradition has been narrated on the authority of Nu'man bin Bashir through another chain of transmitters.

This hadith entailed that the statement of Ali in which he preferred Jihad over custodianship of the Ka'abah and providing drinking water for the pilgrims is sounder than the statements of those who preferred maintenance of the House of Allah and providing water to the pilgrims. It showed that Ali is more knowledgeable of the truth on this issue than those who differed with him on it. This is sound.

With regard to precedence in belief, migration, and fighting Jihad; this has been established for all the companions who believe in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), migrated to Madina and fought Jihad in the cause of Allah. Therefore, there isn't any exclusive virtue to Ali with regard to these issues, so that one can say: This has not been established to other than him!

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF PRIVATE CONSULTATION PROVES THE LEADERSHIP OF ALI.

The Rafidi stated: “The eighteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most high: **‘O you who believe! When you (want to) consult the Messenger (Muhammad SAW) in private, spend something in charity before your private consultation. That will be better and purer for you. But if you find not (the means for it), then verily, Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful’ (58:12).** From Abu Nu’aim on the authority of Ibn Abbas who said: ‘Allah forbids private consultation with the Prophet (s.a.w) if charity is not given (to the needy), they become misers and refused to give charity before privately consulting him. Ali is the only one who gave charity before private consultation and nobody did that among the Muslims (except him).’ From Tha’alabi exegesis of the Qur’an Ibn Umar said: ‘Ali has three virtues and if I possess one of them, that will be better for me than possessing a lot of wealth: His marriage to Fatima, the flag (of Jihad) that was given to him on the day of the battle of Khaibar, and the verse of private consultation.’ Razin bin Mu’awiyah narrated in his book al-Jami’u bainal Sihah as-Sitta, on the authority of Ali: Nobody acted upon this verse except me, it is because of me that Allah lessen its burden on this community.’ This showed that he is better than them and therefore, he more deserved to be the leader.”

We reply saying: What has been established is that Ali gave charity and had private consultation with the Prophet (s.a.w) and then working with the verse was abrogated before anyone else act upon its precepts. The fact is that the verse is not making giving charity obligatory upon them. The verse commanded that whoever want to have private consultation with the Prophet (s.a.w) to give charity before doing so and therefore, whoever do not intend to have private consultation with him, is not required to give charity. Since having private consultation with the Prophet (s.a.w) is not compulsory, nobody can be blame for abandoning what is not compulsory or for abandoning giving charity because he does not have the means; but

if he has means he can give the charity and hold the private consultation; such a person has good intention and he will be recompensed for it. The person who has no cause for holding private consultation with the Prophet (s.a.w) cannot be considered out of order. The person who has a cause and need for the private consultation and abandoned it due to miserliness; such a person has abandoned what is desirable and nobody can be able to prove that any of the three Caliphs is in this group and nobody can be able to establish that all of them are present in Madina when this verse was revealed. Nay, it is possible that some of them are absent, some of them might have need for the consultation and some of them might not have the need for the private consultation. The time period before acting upon the teaching of the verse was abrogated was not long and thus, it did not take long time so that it will be assumed that the need for private consultation must have arisen (for many people). With the presumption that somebody among them has abandoned a desired act of worship; we have explained many times that whoever did a desired act of worship is absolutely not better than the person who did not do it.

In a Marfu' ("elevated": A narration from the Prophet) hadith that was narrated in Tirmidhi stated: ***"It is not suitable for a nation among whom is Abubakar to be lead in prayer by anyone else."*** The act of preparing an army with one thousand camels by Uthman^[178] is greater charity than the charity of Ali, for surely spending in Jihad is obligatory in contrast to giving charity to an individual, before holding a private consultation, for this is conditional upon intending to hold the consultation and thus the person who does not need the consultation is not required to give the charity. Allah has said concerning some men from among the Ansar: ***"And those who, before them, had homes (in Madina) and had adopted the Faith, love those who emigrate to them, and have no jealousy in their breasts for that which they have been given (from the booty of Bani An-Nadir), and give them (emigrants) preference over themselves, even though they were in need of***

that. And whosoever is saved from his own covetousness, such are they who will be the successful” (59:9).

Summarily the door of spending on the path of Allah contained a lot of virtues and outstanding works that has been done by many men among the Muhajirun and Ansar, which has not been attained by Ali, for he did not possess wealth at the time of the Prophet (s.a.w).

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF QUESTIONING PAST PROPHETS PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: The nineteenth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘And ask (O Muhammad) those of Our Messengers whom We sent before you...’ (43:45).**^[179] Ibn Nu’aim and Ibn Abdul Bir narrated that: ‘On the day the Prophet (s.a.w) was raised to Heavens, he was made to meet Prophets (a.s). He was commanded: ‘Ask them O Muhammad (s.a.w), concerning what they were sent (to their various nations!’ When he asked them, they replied: ‘We were sent with bearing testimony that there is nobody worthy of being worshipped but Allah, accepting your Prophethood and accepting the leadership of Ali bin Abi Talib.’ This has clearly established the leadership of Ali.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for this hadith and those similar to it to be proven as sound and reliable. We are saying concerning this ugly lie and similar ones: We are requesting that its soundness shall be proven. We never doubt that, this hadith and those similar to it are the most foolish, ugly, and reckless lies. On the basis of lessening the heat of debate we say: If this man did not know that it is a lie, he shouldn’t advance it as a proof until he establish its soundness, for making argument with that which reliability is not established is not allowed by the consensus of scholars. This is a form of speaking without knowledge and it is forbidden by the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w) and consensus of Muslims.

Secondly: This hadith is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: Whoever has knowledge in religious sciences knew that this is a fabricated, spurious lie and nobody that has religion and intellect can accept it. This can only be fabricated by a reckless, shameless, and insolent liar, for how can the Prophets (a.s) be asked concerning what is not part of principle of beliefs?

Muslim have agreed upon the fact that if a person believe in the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and obeyed him and died during his period before he know that Allah has created Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali, that will not harm him and it won't prevent him from entering Paradise. If this has been established in the community of Muhammad (s.a.w), how can anybody say: It is obligatory for all past Prophets (and their communities) to believe in one person among the companions?

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF KEEN EAR PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twentieth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘That We might make it a remembrance for you, and the keen ear (person) may (hear and) understand it’ (69:12).** Tha’alabi recorded in his exegesis of the Qur’an that the prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘I have supplicated to Allah to make it your ear, O Ali.’ Abu Nu’aim narrated that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘O Ali! Allah has commanded me to bring you close to me and teach you, O Ali! Certainly, Allah has commanded me to bring you close to me and teach you so that you will understand,’ at that moment this was revealed to me: **‘That We might make it a remembrance for you, and the keen ear (person) may (hear and) understand it’ (69:12).** Therefore, you are the keen ear.’ This virtue has not occurred to other than him and thus he is the leader.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand you to prove the soundness of its chain of authority. Tha’alabi and Abu Nu’aim narrated what cannot be accepted as evidence by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Secondly: These hadiths are fabricated by the consensus of scholars of hadiths.

Thirdly: Allah the Most High has said: **“Verily! When the water rose beyond its limits (Noah’ flood), We carried you (mankind) in the floating (ship that was constructed by Noah). That We might make it a remembrance for you, and the keen ear (person) may (hear and) understand it” (69:11-12).** Absolutely this verse did not intend the ear of just one person among people, for it is addressing all human beings. It is informing them that carrying them on the ark (on Ships and Canoes) is one of the greatest signs of Allah. Allah the Most Exalted said: **“And an Ayah (sign) for them is that We bore their offspring in the laden ship (of Noah)]. And We have created for them of the like thereunto, so on them they ride” (36:41-42).** In another verse Allah said: **“See you not that the**

ships sail through the sea by Allah's Grace? that He may show you of His Signs? Verily, in this are signs for every patient, grateful (person)” (31:31. How can all these verses be for the understanding of one man among people?

Yes! The ear of Ali is among discerning ears in the like manner of the ear of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and other people. Therefore, this is not exclusive to Ali. It is known out of necessity that discerning ear is not the ear of Ali alone. Do you believe that the ear of the Prophet (s.a.w) is not discerning? Do you believe that ear of Hasan, Husain, ‘Ammar, Abu Dhar, Miqdad, Salman al-Farisi and Sahl bin Hanif, among those who they (Shia Rafidah) accepts their virtues and faith are not discerning ears? Thus, if Ali and other people possess discerning ears, it is prohibited to say: This outstanding trait does not occur to other than him!

Undoubtedly, this Rafidi is an ignorant, unjust person who is basing his arguments on false premises. Surely, it is not known among the sects of innovations any sect that has flimsier proofs and arguments more than Shia Rafidah. This is in contrast to the Mu’atazilites and sects similar to them for they possess proofs and arguments that can put many scholars and intelligent men into ambiguity and doubt. The Shia Rafidah absolutely possess no acceptable proof except to the ignorant or an unjust person of vain desires who accept whatever agrees with his desire whether it is right or wrong.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT SURATUL IHSAN OF THE QUR'AN PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The twenty first evidence: The Chapter 76 (al-Insan) of the Qur'an. In the exegesis of the Qur'an by Tha'alabi, it was narrated from different sources that: 'Hasan and Husain become sick and their grandfather, the Prophet (s.a.w) and generality of the Arabs visited them. They said to him (Ali): O Abul Hasan, you shall make a vow to your Lord for the health of your children. He promised to fast for three days if they regain their health and Fatima, their mother vowed to Allah, that she will fast for three days and their maid Fiddah also promised likewise. They regained their health and there is nothing of food with the family of Muhammad (s.a.w). Ali went and borrowed three measures of wheat. Fatima grinded one measure and produce out of it five loafs of bread, each one of them will have a loaf. Ali prayed Magrib (Sun set) prayer with the Prophet (s.a.w), then went to his house. His wife brought the food to him and at that moment a poor man come to their door and said: 'Peace be upon you, people of the Prophet's household, I am a poor man among the Muslims. Feed me may Allah sustain you from the food of Paradise.' Ali heard him and he commanded that the beggar be given the food and it was given to him. They remained without food that day and night, they never taste anything except plain water.

In the second day Fatima made bread from the second measure of the wheat. Ali prayed Magrib with the Prophet (s.a.w) and returned to his house. His wife brought food to him and placed it before him. At that moment an orphan come and stood by their door and said: 'Peace be upon you, members of the Prophet's household. I am an orphan among the children of Muhajirun, my father was martyred on the day of 'Aqbah. Feed me may Allah feed you from the food of Paradise.' Ali heard him and he commanded that the food shall be given to him and they gave him the food. They remained for two days and two nights without tasting anything except plain water.

On the third day Fatima took the third measure of the wheat, grind it and made bread out of it. Ali prayed Magrib prayer with the Prophet (s.a.w) and then returned home. The food was placed before him and at that moment a war captive come to his door and said: 'Do you take us as captives and disperse us and you are not feeding us? Feed me, for I am a war captive of Muhammad (s.a.w), may Allah feed you from the food of Paradise.' Ali heard him and commanded that the food shall be given to him and he was given the food. They thus, remained for three days and three nights without tasting anything except plain water.

On the fourth day, they have fulfilled their vows. Ali took the hand of Hasan with his right hand and Husain with his left hand and went towards the Prophet (s.a.w), while they are shivering like chicks due to intense hunger. When the Prophet (s.a.w) saw them he said: 'O Abul Hasan! I really feel bad about your conditions. Let us go the house of my daughter Fatima.' They went to her while she was in her room, her stomach has sunk down and become attached to her back due to intense hunger and her eyes has sunk into her sockets. When the Prophet (s.a.w) saw her he said: 'O help me! By Allah! the household of Muhammad (s.a.w) is dying of hunger!'

At that moment Angel Gabriel descended to Muhammad (s.a.w) and said: 'Take what Allah has given you as a solace for members of your family.' He said: 'What shall I take, O Gabriel?' He read to him Chapter 76 of the Qur'an."

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration, the mere ascription of a narration to Tha'alabi or Wahidi or people similar to them do not make it sound by the consensus of both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. If two people differed on an issue of law or virtue and one of them argue with a hadith and he did not mention what establishes its soundness except a narration quoted by one of those people in his exegesis of the Qur'an; that did not make it sound (or showed that it is sound) and it is not an evidence for the person who has disagreed with him, by the consensus of scholars.

Secondly: This hadith is a fabricated, spurious, lied hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith, who are the sages, authorities, and judges on this issue. The verdict given by those people is what is relied upon on this issue.

Thirdly: There are a lot of signs and evidences that proved that this is a lied fabricated hadith, among which are:

Ali married Fatima in Madina and he did not consummate that marriage until after the battle of Badr and this fact has been established in Bukhari and Muslim. Hasan and Husain were born after that, either in the third year or the fourth year after migration to Madina. All scholar have agreed upon the fact that Ali married Fatima in Madina; this is a general concurrent knowledge that is known to all those who have little knowledge of history.

Chapter 76 (al-Insan) of the Qur'an is a Makkan Chapter (it was revealed in Makka) by the consensus of scholars of exegesis of the Qur'an and hadith and nobody among them say that it was revealed in Madina. Its content is that of Makkan Chapters, such as teaching the principles of religion that are shared by all Prophets, like belief in Allah and the Last Day and mentioning creation and Resurrection. Since it is a chapter that was revealed in Makka before Ali married Fatima, narrating that it was revealed after Hasan and Husain have fallen sick (and become well) is a very clear, unambiguous lie.

Fourthly: The context of this hadith and its expressions shows clear fabrication by ignorant liars. Among those expressions is there statement: "Their grandfather and the generality of the Arabs visited them." Certainly, generality of the Arabs are not living in Madina and Arabs are unbelievers, and thus they will not come in order to visit them. Among those expressions is: "They said, O Abul Hasan! You shall make vow to your Lord for the health of your children." Ali is not learning his religion from those Arabs, nay he takes his religion from the Prophet (s.a.w). If this is a command to obey Allah; the Prophet (s.a.w) will be more suitable and has more right to command him to do it than those Arabs and if it is not an obedience to Allah; Ali shall not act upon what they command him to do. Furthermore, how can

he accept such a command from them without referring it to the Prophet (s.a.w)?

Fifthly: It comes in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) has prohibited making vows. Ibn Umar reported that Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) forbade (people) taking vows, and said: ***"It does not (necessarily) bring good (in the form of substantial, and tangible results), but it is the meant whereby something is extracted from the miserly persons"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). Therefore, if Ali, Fatima and their children did not know this and most of the Muslims knew it; then this is a defect in their knowledge. Where is the claimed infallibility? If they knew this hadith and yet they committed what is not an obedience to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and something that is not beneficial to themselves, nay they are forbidden to do it; either because it is an abomination or because it is a waste; then this is a defect either in their religion or in their knowledge and intellect.

Sixthly: Ali and Fatima did not possess a Maid who is called Fiddah and nobody among the scholars that recorded their minute and detailed history has mentioned that they have a Maid.

Seventhly: It come in a sound hadith that some person from among the Ansar preferred his guest over himself, his family and children. Narrated Abu Huraira: ***A man came to the Prophet. The Prophet sent a messenger to his wives (to bring something for that man to eat) but they said that they had nothing except water. Then Allah's Apostle said, "Who will take this (person) or entertain him as a guest?" An Ansar man said, "I." So he took him to his wife and said to her, "Entertain generously the guest of Allah's Apostle " She said, "We have got nothing except the meals of my children." He said, "Prepare your meal, light your lamp and let your children sleep if they ask for supper." So she prepared her meal, lighted her lamp and made her children sleep, and then stood up pretending to mend her lamp, but she put it off. Then both of them pretended to be eating, but they really went to bed hungry. In the morning the Ansari went to Allah's Apostle who said, "Tonight Allah laughed or wondered at your action."***

Then Allah revealed: "But give them (emigrants) preference over themselves even though they were in need of that And whosoever is saved from the covetousness Such are they who will be successful." (59:9) This praise is greater than the praise: "And they give food, in spite of their love for it (or for the love of Him), to Miskin (poor), the orphan, and the captive" (76:8). And this is like His words: "... and gives his wealth, in spite of love for it, to the kinsfolk, to the orphans, and to Al-Masakin (the poor) ..." (2:177).

Eighthly: this type of story shall not be ascribed to Ali and Fatima for it has gone contrary to religious precepts; that is leaving their children to go hungry for three consecutive days and nights. This type of hunger can destroy the body, the mind (intellect) and religion of a person. This is not similar to the story of the man from the Ansar who made his children go to sleep without supper, just for one night, for children can withstand this situation in contrast to going hungry for three consecutive days and nights.^[180]

Ninthly: In the story it was stated that the orphan said: "My father was martyred on the day of 'Aqaba." This is a clear, very distinct lie, for there isn't any fight in the night of Aqaba.^[181] What happens is that the Prophet (s.a.w) received vow of allegiance from the Ansar before he migrated to Madina and before he was given permission to fight. This showed that this hadith is spurious and a fabricated lie that has been fabricated by the most ignorant person with history of the Prophet (s.a.w). If to say he said: He was martyred on the day of Uhud, it will be closer to reality.

Tenthly: The Prophet (s.a.w) used to take care of the children of the martyred and provide for their needs and that is why when Fatima asked him to give her a servant, he replied her saying: ***"I will not abandon the orphans of Badr and give you."***

SEGMENT: NEGATING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THE ONE WHO BROUGHT THE TRUTH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twenty second evidence: The words of Allah: **‘And he (Muhammad) who has brought the truth (this Quran and Islamic Monotheism) and (the one who) believed therein (i.e. the true believers of Islamic Monotheism), those are Al- Muttaqun (the pious and righteous persons)’ (93:33).** Ab u Nu’aim narrated that Mujahid said: ‘He who brought the truth,’ means Muhammad (s.a.w) and ‘The one who believed therein,’ means Ali. The same interpretation was given by al-Faqih ash-Shafi’i. This is a virtue to Ali and thus, he shall be the leader.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: This has not been transmitted from the Prophet (s.a.w) and the interpretation of Mujahid alone is not an evidence that must be accepted by all Muslims. Then, how about if he did not say it? The person who claimed that Mujahid has given this interpretation is a notorious liar. What was soundly reported from Mujahid has contradicted the above claim, for he said: “The truth,” is the Qur’an and the “one who believed therein,” is the believer who acted upon it. Thus, he made it general on all believers who acted upon its precepts.

Secondly: This has been contradicted by what is more known by the exegetist of the Qur’an, which is, the one who brought the truth is Muhammad (s.a.w) and the one who believed therein is Abubakar. This has been stated by a number of scholars and it was mentioned by at-Tabari with its chain of authority to Ali bin Abi Talib.

Thirdly: Expression of the verse is general and not exclusive to Abubakar or Ali. Nay, whoever accepted the truth and act upon its precepts is encompassed by its verdict. Certainly, Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali have more right to be encompassed by its verdict than anyone else in the Islamic community, but it is not exclusive to them only.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF SUPPORT WITH HELP PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twenty third evidence: **The words of Allah: ‘And if they intend to deceive you, then verily, Allah is All-Sufficient for you. He it is Who has supported you with His Help and with the believers’ (9:62).** Abu Nu’aim stated that Abu Huraira said: ‘It was written on the Throne (of Allah): There is nobody worthy of being worshipped but Allah, He has no partner, Muhammad is My slave and Messenger, I supported him with Ali bin Abi Talib. That is the meaning of the words of Allah: **‘And if they intend to deceive you, then verily, Allah is All-Sufficient for you. He it is Who has supported you with His Help and with the believers,’ (9:63).** It means I supported you (Muhammad) with Ali.’ This is his greatest virtue which has not been attained by anyone among the companions. Thus, he shall be the leader.”

Answer to the above contention will be given from many perspectives as follows:

Firstly: We request for the soundness of the narration, for mere ascribing it to the narrations of Abu Nu’aim is not an evidence by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Abu Nu’aim has a well known book on the virtues of the Prophet’s companions, he mentioned many virtues at the beginning of his book “Hilyatul Awliya.” If they (Shia Rafidah) are accepting what he narrates; then, he has narrated many hadiths on the virtues of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman that contradicted their basis and destroyed their principles and if they do not accept what he narrates; then, they shall not be relying on his narrations to support their creed.

We usually refer whatever he (Abu Nu’aim) narrated – he and other people – to the scholars of this science and the methods through which sound and fabricated hadith are differentiated, such as studying its chain of authority, the men who narrated it; are they reliable men who received the knowledge directly from each other or not? We also look at the texts that support the hadith and that which

showed its reliability or falseness. We do not differentiate between what has been narrated on the virtues of Ali or on the virtues of other people. Whatever is confirmed as sound we accept it and whatever we establish to be fabricated we reject it.

Secondly: The hadith is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith. We are certain that this hadith and those similar to it are spurious fabricated lies. We knew - by Allah Who has no partner – with certainty in our hearts, by conviction that we cannot be able to repel from our minds, that this hadith is a lie and that Abu Hurairah never stated it. This is our stand on similar hadiths that we adjudged as fabricated.

Thirdly: Allah the Most High is saying: **“And if they intend to deceive you, then verily, Allah is All-Sufficient for you. He it is Who has supported you with His Help and with the believers. And He has united their (i.e. believers) hearts. If you had spent all that is in the earth, you could not have united their hearts, but Allah has united them. Certainly He is All-Mighty, All-Wise” (8:62-63).** This Qur’anic text established that believers are a number of people who Allah has united their hearts (قلوبهم) and Ali is one of them for he does not have hearts that can be united. The word “believers,” is a plural form and thus, this is a distinct text that cannot accept probability that He means one particular person. Then, how is it possible for anyone to say: Ali is the only person intended by the verse?

Fourthly: We knew out of necessity and by concurrent reports that the religion was not and never established because Ali has accepted Islam. Ali is among the first to embrace Islam and at that time the religion is weak. If it is not because Allah has guided those He has guided to belief, immigration, and support, nothing will take place with Ali alone of victory and establishment (of religion). Furthermore, people did not embrace Islam, immigrated and aided Islam because of Ali. Ali never stand up in Makka or in Madina calling people to believe in Allah, in a similar manner by which Abubakar stood up inviting people to Islam in Makka. It is never transmitted that anybody among the first and foremost to embrace Islam have done

so at the hand of Ali; neither from among the Muhajirun nor from the Ansar. Nay, we never know anybody who embraced Islam at the hand of Ali among the Prophet's companions. But when the Prophet (s.a.w) sent him to Yemen, may be some people have embraced Islam through him and those are not among the companions. In contrast to this, many among the grand companions embraced Islam at the hand of Abubakar. Ali did not use to stand before the polytheists arguing with them and inviting them to Islam as is done by Abubakar and the polytheists do not fear him in the like manner that they feared Abubakar and Umar.

Fifthly: Their isn't any outstanding grand work (achievement) that Ali attained and or has done except that we find among the companions a person (or persons) who has attained similar achievements and some of them have greater achievements than his own. This fact is well known to those who are learned in the history of the Prophet's companions which has been soundly transmitted. With regard to those who are accepting the narrations of liars and road side story tellers; to them the door of lies is wide open and this type of lying is related to lying against Allah the Most High: **"And who does more wrong than he who invents a lie against Allah or denies the truth (Muhammad and his doctrine of Islamic Monotheism and this Quran), when it comes to him? Is there not a dwelling in Hell for disbelievers (in the Oneness of Allah and in His Messenger Muhammad)?" (29:68).**

Therefore, how can anybody argue that the Prophet (s.a.w) was aided by only one person among his companions to the exclusion of all of them, while this is the reality? Where is the aid and support he got from all the believers among the first and foremost to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar who gave him their vow of allegiance under the tree and those who followed them with goodness?

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ALLAH SUFFICES YOU AND THOSE WHO FOLLOW YOU AMONG THE BELIEVERS PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The twenty fourth evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **'O Prophet (Muhammad)! Allah is Sufficient for you and for the believers who follow you' (8:64)**. Abu Nu'aim stated that it was revealed concerning Ali. This virtue did not occur to any of the companions. Therefore, he is the leader.

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: It is not a sound statement.

Secondly: This statement is not is not a proof.

Thirdly: This is the greatest lie against Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). This is because His words: **"O Prophet (Muhammad SAW)! Allah is Sufficient for you and for the believers who follow you" (8:64)**, means: Allah suffices you and He suffices those who followed you among the believers. Thus, He Alone is sufficient for you and those who believe in you and followed you. This is similar to the statement of Arabs such as: One Dirham suffices you and Zaid. Some people made mistake and interpreted the verse as: "Allah and the believers are sufficient for you," and this is an ugly mistake that can lead to unbelief; surely, Allah is enough for him and all created beings.

If this is clear you will understand that those Shia Rafidah have arranged ignorance over ignorance and thus they become in darkness one above another and they think that: **"O Prophet (Muhammad)! Allah is Sufficient for you and for the believers who follow you" (8:64)**, means Allah and those who followed you among the believers are sufficient for you and therefore, they said that those believers that followed him is Ali bin Abi Talib (alone). Their ignorance in this issue is clearer than their ignorance on the first issue, for the first might be ambiguous to some people, but this one cannot be hidden to an intelligent person. Certainly, Ali alone

cannot suffice the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and if he has nobody except him his religion will not have been established.

This is Ali, he couldn't suffice himself at the time when he has a great army (most of the armies of the Muslim nations) behind him. Nay, when Mu'awiyah fought him with the Syrians, he was resisting him and getting victories over him either with his fighting force or with the force of deception and stratagem and there is deception in war. Thus, if he cannot be sufficient for himself after Islam has been established and with him is a great army of Muslim nations; how can he be able to be sufficient for the Prophet of Allah (s.a.w) while most of the people of the earth are against him?

If it is said: Ali was not able to overcome Mu'awiyah and his companions because his armies are disobedient to him, nay they used to differ with him. It will be replied that: If those Muslims that are with him are not obeying him, how do you expect unbeliever to obey him, while they have disbelieved in his Prophet and they have disbelieved in him?

It is well known that people followed the truth when they embraced Islam more than before they embrace it. Therefore, the person who is a partner of Allah in establishing the religion of Muhammad (s.a.w); to the extent that he subdued the unbelievers and made people embrace Islam: How come that such a person is not able to defeat and subdue a party that has committed aggression against him and they are less in number than the unbelievers that exist when the Prophet (s.a.w) was sent with his message; they are less than them in strength and closer than them to the truth!

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE ALLAH WILL LOVE THEM AND THEY WILL LOVE HIM PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The twenty fifth evidence: the words of Allah the Most High: **'O you who believe! Whoever from among you turns back from his religion (Islam), Allah will bring a people whom He will love and they will love Him; humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is AllSufficient for His creatures' needs, AllKnower'** (5:54). Tha'alabi said it was revealed concerning Ali. This showed that he is the best and thus, he is the leader."

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: This is a lie against Tha'alabi because he stated while interpreting the verse: "Ali bin Abi Talib, Qatadah, and Hasan said: 'It is Abubakar and his companions.' Mujahid said: 'They are the people of Yemen.'" He also mentioned the hadith of Iyad bin Ghanim that they are the people of Yemen and he mentioned the hadith in which the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***"The people of Yemen have come to you, and they are more soft hearted and gentle hearted people. The capacity for understanding religion is Yemenite and Wisdom is Yemenite"* (Bukhari)**. Tha'alabi has certainly narrated that Ali interpreted this verse saying: "They are Abubakar and his companions."

Secondly: This is a mere statement without evidence and thus it is not obligatory to accept it.

Thirdly: This has contradicted what is well known and more distinct, which is it was revealed concerning Abubakar and his companions; those who fought the apostates with him. This is what is known to the people, but those liars want to take away the virtues that come concerning Abubakar and ascribe them to Ali. This nothing but an evil stratagem and evil plotting encompasses only the person who device it.

Fourthly: What has been concurrently narrated from people is that the person who fought the apostates is Abubakar as-Siddiq. It was he who fought Musailamah the liar, the man who claimed that he is a prophet and those who followed him from Bani Hanifa and the people of Yamamah; it was said that they are about one hundred thousand or more men. He also fought Tulaiha al-Asadi who claimed that he is a prophet in Najd and he was followed by men from the tribes of Asad, Tamim and Gafan. A woman called Sajjah claimed that she is a prophetess and Musalamah the liar married her and thus, a liar married a liar.

Those people who fought the apostates are the people who are loved by Allah and they deserved more than anybody to be encompassed by the verse. The same could be said about those who fought the Roman and Persian unbelievers, and they are Abubakar, Umar and their followers among the people of Yemen and other regions. That is why this verse was revealed and the Prophet was asked about them (who are they?), he pointed to Abu Musa al-Ash'ari and said: ***“They are the people of this man” (Bukhari).***^[182]

This is an issue that is known out of necessity and through concurrent traditions, that those who establish the religion, remain steadfast during the period of apostasy and fought the apostates and the unbelievers; they are the people who are embraced by the words of Allah: **“O you who believe! Whoever from among you turns back from his religion (Islam), Allah will bring a people whom He will love and they will love Him; humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is AllSufficient for His creatures' needs, AllKnower” (5:54).** With regard to Ali: Certainly, he is among those who love Allah and Allah loves them, but he does not deserve this trait more than Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and his fighting against unbelievers and apostates is not greater than the Jihad of those people and the Islamic religion did not attain goodness through him greater than the goodness it has attained through those people. Nay, each one of

them has made efforts that deserved to be thanked and good works that deserved to be recompensed. They left righteous examples (deserving emulation) in Islam. Allah will repay them for their services to Islam and the Muslim with the best of recompense. They are rightly guided Caliphs, who lead people with the truth and establish justice therewith.

Therefore, for anybody to come to the leaders of the Islamic community whose benefits for religion and worldly affairs (of the people) are greater (and uncountable) and turn them into unbelievers, profligates and unjust oppressors. And then he come to the person whose benefits that are attained through him did not reach the benefits that are attained through any of those leaders and turn him into a partner to Allah or a partner to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) or an infallible leader (who must lead immediately after the Prophet and whose obedience is compulsory), and whoever did not believe in that is an unbeliever. He also turns the unbelievers and the apostates that have been fought by those leaders to Muslims (who have been fought unjustly) and he turn Muslims who are praying the five daily prayers, they fast the month of Ramadan, they perform the pilgrimage to the House of Allah and they believe in the Qur'an into unbelievers because they have fought those apostates. This is nothing but the acts of men of ignorance, lies, injustice, and unbelief in the religion of Allah. These are acts of those who have no intellect, no religion, and no sound belief.

Fifthly: Let us assume that the verse was revealed concerning Ali. Can anybody claim that it is exclusive and specific to him only while its expression clearly showed that they are a group of men? Allah the Most High said: **“O you who believe! Whoever from among you turns back from his religion (Islam), Allah will bring a people whom He will love and they will love Him; humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is All Sufficient for His creatures' needs, All-Knower” (5:54).** Is this not clear and distinct that those people are

not a person? Certainly, a man cannot be called a people (قَوْمٍ) in the Arabic language neither in reality nor figuratively.

If it is said: What is meant is Ali and his party.

It will be replied that: If the verse has encompassed Ali and other people; certainly those who fought the unbelievers and apostates has more right to be encompassed by it than the one who fought Muslims (during his Caliphate). Certainly, the people of Yemen who fought under the command of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman are more deserved to be encompassed by it than Shia Rafidah who are befriending and supporting the Jews, The Christians and the polytheists and they are holding as enemies the first and foremost Muslims.

Sixthly: The words of Allah the Most High: **“O you who believe! Whoever from among you turns back from his religion (Islam), Allah will bring a people whom He will love and they will love Him; humble towards the believers, stern towards the disbelievers, fighting in the Way of Allah, and never afraid of the blame of the blamers. That is the Grace of Allah which He bestows on whom He wills. And Allah is All Sufficient for His creatures' needs, All-Knower” (5:54).** This verse is a general expression and nothing in it is made specific to a particular person and thus it encompasses whoever acquires those characteristics. It is neither specific to Abubakar nor to Ali and since it is not specific to anyone of them; then, it is not his exclusive virtues and therefore, his being the best among those who shared them with him is hereby nullified. Then, what more about the reason that made him to be more deserved to be the leader?

Certainly, this verse teaches that nobody can apostate from the religion of Islam to the Last Day except that Allah will raise another people who He loves and they loves Him and who are humble towards the believers, stern toward the disbelievers and they will fight those apostates.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE THOSE ARE THE SINCERE PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twenty sixth evidence. The words of Allah: **“And those who believe in (the Oneness of) Allah and His Messengers, they are the Siddiqun (sincere), and the martyrs with their Lord, they shall have their reward and their light. But those who disbelieve (in the Oneness of Allah - Islamic Monotheism) and deny Our Ayat (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.), they shall be the dwellers of the blazing Fire” (57:19).** Ahmad bin Hanbal narrated from Ibn Abi Laila, from his father who said, the Prophet (s.a.w) says: ‘There are three sincere men: Habib bin Musa an-Najjar, the believer of family of Yasin who said: **‘O my people, follow the Prophets.’** Hizaqeel the believer of family of Pharaoh, who said: **‘Do you kill a man because he says: Allah is my Lord?’** Ali bin Abi Talib is the third of them and he is the best among them.’ Ibn Maghazili and the author of al-Firdaus have narrated similar hadiths. This virtue showed that he is the leader.”

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this hadith. This hadith is not in the Musnad of Imam Ahmad and even if he narrates it in the chapter under virtues, it cannot be considered a sound hadith by the consensus of the scholars of hadith, because he usually record what people have narrated even if its soundness has not been established. All scholars knew that it is not everything that Ahmad recorded under virtues and similar chapters are sound. Nay, and not every hadiths in the Musnad are sound. Ahmad recorded hadiths from those who are known among scholars as transmitters of hadith, whose tendency to lie is not apparent, but some of it has some defects that can be detected showing that it is weak, nay false and fabricated. But most of the hadiths in his Musnad are good and they can be accepted as proofs; his hadith are better than those found in Sunan Abu Dawud. Not every hadith that he recorded in the Musnad

under virtues are sound. How is it with you, if you find that this hadith has not been narrated by Ahmad, neither in the Musnad nor in the book on Fada'il (virtues of the companions). This hadith is among the additions made by al-Qutai'i.

Secondly: This hadith is a lied fabrication against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

Thirdly: It come in sound hadiths that many people beside Ali are called the sincere. In sound hadiths Abubakar is called the sincere. Then how can anybody say: There are only three sincere men? Anas bin Malik narrated that: ***"The Prophet ascended the mountain of Uhud and he was accompanied by Abubakar, 'Umar and 'Uthman. The mountain shook beneath them. The Prophet hit it with his foot and said, 'O Uhud ! Be firm, for on you there is none but a Prophet, a Siddiq (sincere) and a martyr (i.e. and two martyrs)'"*** (Bukhari, Muslim).

Fourthly: Mary (the mother of Jesus) was named the sincere by Allah the Most High. Allah said: ***"Christ the son of Mary was no more than a messenger; many were the messengers that passed away before him. His mother was a woman of truth (sincere)..."*** (5:75). Then, how can anybody say there are only three sincere people?

Fifthly: If the Rafidi mean by his statement: "There are only three sincere men," that nobody is sincere except those three people! Then that is a lie and it has contradicted the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Messenger (s.a.w) and the consensus of the Muslims. If he means by his statement that those three men are the only perfect sincere people; then, this is also a mistake because our community is the best community raised up for mankind and thus how can the believer in Moses (a.s) and Jesus (a.s) be better than the believer in Muhammad (s.a.w)?

Sixthly: Allah the Most High said: ***"And those who believe in (the Oneness of) Allah and His Messengers, they are the Siddiqun (sincere), and the martyrs with their Lord, they shall have their***

reward and their light...” (57:19). This entailed that any believer who believe in Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w) is a sincere person.

Seventhly: If the sincere person is the person who deserved to be the leader, then the foremost person who deserved to be the leader he is as-Siddiq (the sincere) is Abubakar. Certainly, this name has been established for him through many proofs and through necessary concurrent narrations that are known by everybody; even enemies of Islam knew this fact and therefore, he is the one who deserved to be the leader. If his being sincere does not entail that he deserved to be the leader more than everybody; then the advanced argument (of the Rafidi) has been negated.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THOSE WHO SPENT THEIR WEALTH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twenty seventh evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: **‘Those who spend their wealth (in Allah's Cause) by night and day, in secret and in public, they shall have their reward with their Lord. On them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve’ (2:274).** Abu Nu’aim narrated that Ibn Abbas said: ‘It was revealed concerning Ali. He possessed four Dirham and he spent (to charity) one Dirham in the day and one Dirham in the night and one Dirham secretly and one Dirham openly.’ Tha’alabi has narrated the same hadith and this did not occur to any other than him. Therefore, he is the best and thus he shall be the leader.”

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration. Just because Abu Nu’aim and Tha’alabi have recorded a hadith does not make it sound.

Secondly: This is a lied fabricated hadith.

Thirdly: The verse is general on whoever spend his wealth on the path of Allah in the day or in the night and openly or secretly. Whoever acts upon its teachings is encompassed by it, whether it is Ali or someone else. The claim that it mean one specific individual is untenable and rejected.

Fourthly: What has been mentioned in the above fabricated hadith has contradicted teachings of the verse. The verse showed that spending is made in two periods which time does not go beyond them and all acts are made in them. An act must be made within a time and time can only be daytime or night time and acts can only be made either secretly or openly. Therefore, if a person spent secretly in the night; he has spent secretly in the night and if a person spent openly in the day; he has spent openly in the daytime.

Fifthly: If we assumed that Ali has done so and the verse was revealed concerning him; is there anything more than spending four Dirham in four situations? This is a righteous act and its door is open to the Last Day and those who are acting upon it are uncountable men and women and whoever has any goodness in him must spend in the path of Allah, by the will of Allah; sometimes in the day time and sometimes in the night time, sometimes secretly and sometimes openly. Therefore, this is not something specific to an individual and thus it does not indicate the virtue (or characteristics) of a leader.

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI IS LEADER OF THOSE CALLED BELIEVERS IN THE QUR'AN

The Rafidi stated: “The twenty eighth evidence: Ahmad bin Hanbal narrated from Ibn Abbas who said: There isn't any verse that beginning with, **‘O you who believe,’** except that Ali is its head and leader, its most honored and its chief. Allah has censured the Prophet's companions in the Qur'an but He never mentions Ali except with goodness. This showed that he is the best and he shall be the leader.”

Answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration to be proven. This hadith is not in the Musnad of Ahmad and a mere narration – if at all he has narrated it – on virtues does not show that it is sound. Then, how about if he did not narrate it; neither in his Musnad nor in the book on virtues of the companions. This hadith is among the additions of al-Qutai'i.

Secondly: This is a lie against Ibn Abbas. What has been concurrently narrated from him is that he gives precedence to Abubakar and Umar over Ali, he faulted a lot of conducts and acts of Ali and went against him in many things, to the extent that when he (Ali) burnt some atheists in fire, who claimed that he is a god, Ibn Abbas said in a hadith narrated by 'Ikrima: ***Some Zanadiqa (atheists) were brought to 'Ali and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn 'Abbas who said, 'If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as Allah's Apostle forbade it, saying, 'Do not punish anybody with Allah's punishment (fire).' I would have killed them according to the statement of Allah's Apostle, 'Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him''' (Bukhari).*** When Ali was informed about his comment, he said: ***“Oh! May Allah forgive the mother of Ibn Abbas.”***

Thirdly: This statement does not contain any praise in favor of Ali, because Allah has disparaged believers with it in many places in the

Qur'an, such as His words: **"O you who believe! Why do you say that which you do not do? Most hateful it is with Allah that you say that which you do not do" (61:2-3).** Therefore, if Ali is the head of this verse, its chief and its leader he has committed this act which Allah has rejected and disparaged (thus, where is infallibility?). Fourthly: He is among those who are encompassed by the expression of the address (O you who believe), even though he is not the cause of the address. Certainly, the expression has encompassed him in the like manner that it encompasses other people. The expression of the verse did not differentiate a believer from a believer.

Fifthly: The statement of somebody from among the companions that; he is head of the verse, and its leader, and that he is its most honored and its chief is unrealistic. If he intended by that, Ali is the first person to be addressed with it; then that is not correct because the address encompassed all those who have been addressed at once; none of them is addressed before the other.

The utmost limit you can go is to say Ibn Abbas used to give precedence to Ali; although this is a lie against Ibn Abbas and it has contradicted his very well-known opinion. Even if we assumed that he said so and his opinion has contradicted that of the generality of the companions; it cannot be considered an evidence.

Sixthly: The statement of someone that Allah has censured the companions of Muhammad (s.a.w) in the Qur'an and He never addressed Ali except with goodness is an open lie, for there is no place in the Qur'an where Allah disparaged Abubakar. Nay, Abubakar never harm the Prophet (s.a.w) and that is why it is reported that he said: ***"O people! You shall know the rights of Abubakar for he never did anything wrong to me."***

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ASKING FOR BELESSING PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The twenty ninth evidence: The words of Allah: **‘Allah sends His Salat (Graces, Honours, Blessings, Mercy, etc.) on the Prophet (Muhammad SAW) and also His angels too (ask Allah to bless and forgive him). O you who believe! Send your Salat on (ask Allah to bless) him (Muhammad SAW), and (you should) greet (salute) him with the Islamic way of greeting (salutation i.e. AsSalamu 'Alaikum)’ (33:56).** In Sahih Bukhari from Ka’ab bin Ujrah who said: We asked the Prophet (s.a.w) saying: ***O Messenger of Allah! How do we aske blessings for you people of the household? He replied: You shall say; O Allah send Your blessings to Muhammad and the family of Muhammad’ (Bukhari, Muslim).*** In Sahih Muslim: We say: O Messenger of Allah! We knew how to great you, but how do we seek blessings for you? He replied say: ***O Allah bless Muhammad and his family, in the like manner that You blessed Abraham and the family of Abraham’ (Bukhari, Muslim).*** There is no doubt that Ali is the best among the family of Muhammad and therefore, he deserved to be the leader more than anyone else.”

We reply to the above contention as follows: There is no doubt that this hadith is sound and agreed upon and that Ali is among the family of Muhammad (s.a.w) who have been encompassed by the words of the Prophet (s.a.w): ***“O Allah bless Muhammad and the family of Muhammad.”*** But this is not his exclusive virtue because all the Banu Hashim are encompassed by this hadith. Such as Abbas and his children, Harith bin Abdumutallab and his children; such as the daughters of the Prophet (s.a.w) – Zainab and the wives of Uthman Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthum and his daughter Fatima; and such as his wives, for it come in sound hadith that: ***Yahya related to me from Malik from Abdullah ibn Abi Bakr ibn Hazim from his father that Amr ibn Sulaym az-Zuraqi said, “Abu Humayd as-Saidi told me that they asked the Messenger of***

Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, how they were to ask for blessings upon him and he replied that they should say, 'O Allah, bless Muhammad and his wives and his descendants as You blessed the family of Ibrahim, and give baraka to Muhammad and his wives and his descendants as You gave baraka to the family of Ibrahim. You are worthy of Praise and Glorious'" (Muwatta).

It come in Bukhari and Muslim that: ***Abu Humaid as-Sa'idi reported: They (the Companions of the Holy Prophet) said: Apostle of Allah, how should we bless you? He (the Holy Prophet) observed: Say:" O Allah! bless Muhammad, his wives and his offspring as Thou didst bless Ibrahim, and grant favors to Muhammad, and his wives and his offspring as Thou didst grant favors to the family of Ibrahim; Thou art Praiseworthy and Glorious" (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Nay, the prayer encompasses all members of his family to the Last Day and it encompass the brothers of Ali such as Ja'afar and 'Aqil.^[183]

It is well known that because those people are encompassed in the prayer of seeking for blessing and greeting with peace, it does not mean that they are better than those who are not encompassed by the prayer and it does not mean that he is suitable for leadership let alone leadership being his specific and exclusive right.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING BATINITE EXEGESIS OF THE QUR'AN ON THE VERSE OF TWO SEAS AS ADVANCED BY THE RAFIDI ABOUT ALI AND OTHERS

The Rafidi stated: "The thirtieth evidence: The word of Allah: **'He has let loosed the two seas (the salt water and the sweet) meeting together. Between them is a barrier which none of them can transgress'** (55:19-20). It comes in the exegesis of the Qur'an by Tha'alabi and from Abu Nu'aim on the authority of Ibn Abbas concerning the words of Allah: **'He has let loosed the two seas meeting together.'** He says it means Ali and Fatima. And: **'Between them is a barrier which none of them can transgress,'** he says it means the Prophet (s.a.w). With regard to the verse: **'Out of them both come out pearl and coral'** (55:22). He says it means Hasan and Husain. Nobody among the companion get this virtue except Ali and therefore, he deserved to be the leader."

We reply that: This and similar statements are made by those who do not understand what they are saying. This is closer to delirium than interpretation of the Qur'an. It is a type of the interpretation of the Qur'an that is made by the atheists, Qarmatians and Batinites. Nay, the evil that this contained is worse than those interpretations. This type of interpretation of the Qur'an is the method of the atheists; it is a form of finding fault with the Qur'an, disparaging it, and condemning it.

This interpretation is among the atheists beliefs of Shia Rafidah such as interpreting the words of Allah: **"...and all things We have recorded with numbers (as a record) in a Clear Book"** (36:12). They say: Clear Book (إِمَامٌ مُبِينٌ) mentioned in this verse means Ali bin Abi Talib. With regard to the words of Allah: **"And Verily, it (this Quran) is in the Mother of the Book (i.e. Al-Lauh Al-Mahfuz), before Us, indeed Exalted, full of Wisdom"** (43:4). They say it is Ali bin Abi Talib and with regard to the words of Allah: **"And (remember) when We told you: "... and likewise the accursed tree in the Quran"** (17:60). They say the accursed tree (الشَّجَرَةُ)

(الْمَلْعُونَةُ) is Banu Umayyah. There are a lot of similar statements that cannot be made except by a person who does not hope for Allah's reward and does not fear His punishment and by the person who do not believe in Allah and His Book. What will explain to you the falsity of that interpretation can be advanced from many perspectives:

Firstly: These verse are from Chapter Fifty Five of the Qur'an and this Chapter was revealed in Makka by the consensus of Muslims and Hasan and Husain are born in Madina.

Secondly: Certainly naming Ali and Fatima as two seas, this one pearl (Hasan) and that one coral (Husain) and sexual intercourse as (Maraj مَرَج) – meeting together – is something that is not known in the Arabic language neither in reality nor figuratively. Nay it is a lie against Allah, the Qur'an and the Arabic language.

Thirdly: There is nothing special about this interpretation which is above the custom of all children of Adam. Therefore, whoever marries a woman and she begets for him two children, he is of this type.

Fourthly: Certainly, Allah mentioned the meeting together of two seas in another verse, He the Most High said: **“And it is He Who has let free the two seas (kinds of water), one palatable and sweet, and the other salt and bitter, and He has set a barrier and a complete partition between them” (25:53).** If this verse the **“palatable and sweet water and salt and bitter water,”** are interpreted to be Ali and Fatima, it will entail disparagement and condemnation of one of them. But this is false by the consensus of Ahlus Sunnah and Shia.

Fifthly: Allah said: **“Between them is a barrier which none can transgress” (55:20).** The Shia Rafidah claimed that the two seas are Ali and Fatima and the Prophet is the barrier – according to their claim – or someone else who is preventing one of them to meet the other. This interpretation is closer to disparagement than to commendations.

Sixthly: All commentators and interpreters of the Qur'an have agreed on what is contrary to this interpretation of Rafidah. The correct

interpretation has been mentioned by Ibn Jarir at-Tabari and other exegetist of the Qur'an.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF THOSE WHO HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCRIPTURE PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidid stated: “The thirty first evidence: The words of Allah: **‘And those who disbelieve, say: ‘You (O Muhammad SAW) are not a Messenger.’ Say: ‘Sufficient for a witness between me and you is Allah and those too who have knowledge of the Scripture.’ (13:43).** Abu Nu’aim narrated that Ibn Hanafiyyah said: ‘Those who have knowledge of the scripture is Ali bin Abi Talib.’ From Tha’alabi’s exegesis of the Qur’an it is narrated that Abdullah bin Salam said: ‘I asked: Who is the person that possessed knowledge of the scripture?’ He replied: That is Ali bin Abi Talib.’ This showed that he is the best and therefore, he shall be the leader.”

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration to be proven as emanating from Abdullah bin Salam and Ibn Hanafiyyah.

Secondly: Under the assumption that they are sound hadiths, they are still not proofs because the generality of the companions have differed with them.

Thirdly: This is a lie against them.

Fourthly: Absolutely, without any tinge of doubt, these are false statements. This is because Allah the Most High has stated: **“And those who disbelieve, say: ‘You (O Muhammad) are not a Messenger.’ Say: ‘Sufficient for a witness between me and you is Allah and those too who have knowledge of the Scripture” (13:43).** If the person intended is Ali, it means that Muhammad (s.a.w) is taking his cousin as a sole witness to the truthfulness of his message. It is well known that if Ali gives testimony to his Prophethood and all that he said; his statement will not benefit Muhammad (s.a.w), it will not be an evidence proving anything and people will not accept it, for they will say: From where did Ali learn

that? He just learned that from Muhammad and he is only testifying for himself.

Furthermore, people will say: This is his cousin, he is among the first to believe in him and thus they will accuse him of sycophancy, love, and attachment to his brother. In contrast to when people of the Book give testimony with what has concurrently reached them from their Prophets; that will be beneficial testimony. In the like manner of the Prophets giving the testimony by themselves to his Prophethood while they exist, this is because what has been established concurrently as emanating from them is similar to giving testimony by themselves.

This ignorant man, who made this story a virtue for Ali has disparaged him, he has disparaged the Prophet who is the factor of Ali becoming a believer and he has disparaged the proof explaining the truthfulness of Islam. Nobody can say this except a Zindiq or an ignorant man who has reached the utmost limit of ignorance. If the Rafidi knew this fact and he still made those statements, then it is a calamity and if he did not know, then the calamity is greater.

Fiftyhly: Allah the Most High has mentioned obtaining testimony (from people of the Book) in many verses of the Qur'an, such as His words: **"Say: 'Tell me! If this (Quran) is from Allah, and you deny it, and a witness from among the Children of Israel ('Abdullah bin Salam) testifies that this Quran is from Allah (Torah), so he believed (embraced Islam) while you are too proud (to believe).' Verily! Allah guides not the people who are Zalimun (polytheists, disbelievers, and wrong-doing)" (46:10).** Do you think that Ali is among the Israelites?

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE ON THE DAY IN WHICH ALLAH WILL NOT DISGRACE THE PROPHET PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The thirty second evidence: The words of Allah the Most High: “... **the Day that Allah will not disgrace the Prophet (Muhammad SAW) and those who believe with him...**” (66:8). Abu Nu’aim narrated from Ibn Abbas, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘The first person to be dressed with clothes of Paradise is Prophet Abraham (a.s) followed by Muhammad (s.a.w) because he is the chosen of Allah and then Ali who walk between them to Paradise. Thereafter, Ibn Abbas recited: “... **the Day that Allah will not disgrace the Prophet (Muhammad SAW) and those who believe with him...**” (66:8). He said, it means Ali and his companions.’ This showed that he is better than other people and therefore, he shall be the leader.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration for this type of story has no basis.

Secondly: This is a lied fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: This is absolutely false for it entailed that Ali is better than Prophet Abraham (a.s) and Muhammad (s.a.w); it is mentioned in the story that he will walk in the middle while they walk beside him, left and right. Whoever gives Ali precedence over them is further in disbelief than Jews and Christians.

Fourthly: It come in sound hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w) in which Ibn Abbas said: ***While Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) stood up to deliver a sermon, he said: O people, Allah would make you assemble barefooted, naked and uncircumcised (and then recited the words of the Qur'an): 'As We created you for the first time, We shall repeat it. (It is) a promise (binding) upon us. Lo! We are to perform it,' and the first person who would be***

clothed on the Day of Resurrection would be (Hadrat) Ibrahim (peace be upon him)” (Bukhari, Muslim). There isn't any mention of Muhammad (s.a.w) or Ali in the hadith and the fact that Abraham (a.s) will be clothed first did not give him precedence over Muhammad (s.a.w).

Fifthly: Allah the Most Exalted has said: **“... the Day that Allah will not disgrace the Prophet (Muhammad SAW) and those who believe with him, their Light will run forward before them and with (their Records Books of deeds) in their right hands they will say: "Our Lord! Keep perfect our Light for us [and do not put it off till we cross over the Sirat (a slippery bridge over the Hell) safely] and grant us forgiveness. Verily, You are Able to do all things” (66:8).** And He said: **“On the Day you shall see the believing men and the believing women their light running forward before them and by their right hands. Glad tidings for you this Day! Gardens under which rivers flow (Paradise), to dwell therein forever! Truly, this is the great success!” (57:12).** These are general texts concerning the believers who are with the Prophet (s.a.w) and the context of the statement showed that it is general and the hadiths that has been transmitted concerning that showed that they are general (encompassing all the believers).

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BEST OF CREATURES PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The thirty third evidence: Allah the Most High has said: **‘Verily, those who believe [in the Oneness of Allah, and in His Messenger Muhammad (Peace be upon him)] including all obligations ordered by Islam] and do righteous good deeds, they are the best of creatures’ (98:7).** Abu Nu’aim narrated from Ibn Abbas, who said: ‘When the verse was revealed the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali: ‘You and your party (Shia) will come in the Day of Resurrection well pleased and well pleasing (to Allah) and your opponents will come wrathful, stricken dumb.’ If he is the best of creatures, it is obligatory that he become the leader.”

We reply to the above from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand that the soundness of this narration be proven, although we have no doubt that, it is a fabricated spurious lie; but if a claimant is asked to prove his narration such a request cannot be refused except by the arrogant (or ignorant). A mere narration of Abu Nu’aim is not evidence by the consensus of Muslim sects.

Secondly: This is a lied, spurious, fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: This claim of the Shia Rafidah can be countered by the claim of those who are saying: Those who believe and do righteous deeds are the Nawasib such as the Kharijites etc., and they are saying: Whoever aided him (Ali) and supported him is an apostate, unbeliever and therefore, he is not among those who believe and do righteous deeds, and they support their belief with the words of Allah: **“... And whosoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, such are the Kafirun (disbelievers)” (5:44).** They opined that whoever made men to judge over the religion of Allah has judged with what Allah has not revealed and he is thus an unbeliever and whoever love and support an unbeliever is himself an unbeliever, for Allah said: **“O you who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as Auliya’ (friends, protectors, helpers, etc.),**

they are but Auliya' to one another. And if any amongst you takes them as Auliya', then surely he is one of them. Verily, Allah guides not those people who are the Zalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers and unjust)" (5:55). They further said: Ali and Uthman and whoever support them have apostate from the religion of Islam, because the Prophet (s.a.w) has said in a hadith reported by Aisha: ***"I heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) say in the company of his Companions: I would be on the Cistern waiting for those who would be coming to me from amongst you. By Allah, some persons would be prevented from coming to me, and I would say: My Lord, they are my followers and people of my Umma. And He would say,: You don't know what they did after you; they had been constantly turning back on their heels (from their religion)" (Muslim).*** They said: Those are the people who judged the blood and properties of Muslims with what Allah has not revealed. They further support their belief with the words of the Prophet (s.a.w): ***"Do not recant to disbelief after me, killing each other" (Bukhari, Muslim).*** They said: Those who killed each other have recanted and apostate from Islam after the Prophet (s.a.w) to unbelief.

These and similar statement are among the arguments of Kharijites, although these arguments and proofs are false without any doubt, but still the arguments and proofs of Shia Rafidah are falser than their own. The Kharijites are more intelligent than Shia Rafidah, they are more truthful than them and they follow the truth more than them; they speak the truth and do not tell lie, they are religious people inwardly and outwardly, but they have strayed from the right path, they are ignorant, dissenters and they have gone out of Islam in the manner in which a bullet is shot out of a gun.

With regard to Shia Rafidah: Ignorance, following vain desires and lying has overcome them and most of their scholars and masses are atheists, Zanadiqah and they neither have desire for religion nor knowledge. They are aptly described by Allah the Most High thus: ***"...They follow but a guess and that which they themselves***

desire, whereas there has surely come to them the Guidance from their Lord!” (53:23).

Fourthly: The words of Allah the Most High: **“Verily, those who believe [in the Oneness of Allah, and in His Messenger Muhammad (Peace be upon him)] including all obligations ordered by Islam] and do righteous good deeds, they are the best of creatures” (98:7).** Is a general statement involving and encompassing whoever has the mentioned characteristics. Then what necessitate making it specific and exclusive to Shia? If they say: Because other than them are unbelievers. We reply: If the unbelief of other than you has been established with a cogent proof, that suffices you from this prolonged argument and if it has not been established, then this evidence will not benefit you because it is not a sound hadith. If you can be able to establish it with another proof; then that can be relied upon and not this verse.

Fifthly: It is concurrently known that Abdullah bin Abbas used to live with and support those who are not Shia over and more than he lives with and support many among the Shia, to the extent that he used to sit with the Kharijites answering their questions, giving them religious verdicts and debating them. Therefore, if his belief concerning those who believe and do good works are only Shia and that all other groups are unbelievers; he will not have done that!

Sixthly: Allah the Most High has said before that verse: **“Verily, those who disbelieve (in the religion of Islam, the Quran and Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him)) from among the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) and Al-Mushrikun will abide in the Fire of Hell. They are the worst of creatures” (98:6).** Then He said: **“Verily, those who believe [in the Oneness of Allah, and in His Messenger Muhammad (Peace be upon him)] including all obligations ordered by Islam] and do righteous good deeds, they are the best of creatures” (98:7).** This explained that those people are neither polytheists nor people of the Book and there are many places where those who believe and good works are mentioned and all those statements, in all instances

are general (and not specific). Then what is the reason for specifying and restricting this verse to the exclusion of similar verses?

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF MAKING KINDRED AND INLAWS PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “Thirty fourth evidence: The words of Allah: **‘And it is He Who has created man from water, and has appointed for him kindred by blood, and kindred by marriage. And your Lord is Ever All-Powerful to do what He will’ (25:54)**. It comes in the exegesis of the Qur’an by Tha’alabi, from Ibn Sirrin who said: ‘The verse was revealed concerning the prophet (s.a.w) and Ali bin Abi Talib. He married Fatima to Ali.’ This virtue has not been established for any other person other than him (Ali). Therefore, he is the best. Thus he is the leader.”

We reply from many angles: We demand for the soundness of the narration to be proven.

Secondly: Certainly, this is a lie against Ibn Sirrin.

Thirdly: A mere statement from Ibn Sirrin in which he contradicted all scholars is not a proof (assuming that it is sound, which it is not).

Fourthly: This verse is in the Twenty Fifth Chapter of the Qur’an (al-Furqan) and it was revealed in Makka – and this verse is among the Makkan verses by the consensus of scholars – before Ali married Fatima. Then, how can the verse intend Ali and Fatima?

Fifthly: The verse is general on all kindred and in-law relationship and there is nothing in it to show that it is restricted or specific to a particular person.

Sixthly: If we assume that the verse is restricted to in-law relationship of Ali; then, mere in-law relation do not prove that a person is the best and better than others by the consensus of Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. Certainly in-law relationship has been established with the Prophet (s.a.w) by all the four Caliphs, although some of them are better than others. Therefore, if in-law relationship make precedence obligatory, it will entail contradiction.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE BE WITH THOSE WHO ARE TRUE PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: The thirty fifth evidence: The words of Allah: **‘O you who believe! Be afraid of Allah, and be with those who are true (in words and deeds)’ (9:119)**. Allah has made it obligatory upon us to be with those who are true and sincere (in words and deeds). Nobody can be like that except an infallible, because he can lie against another person. Therefore, he is Ali because no one is infallible among the four Caliphs except Ali. In a hadith narrated by Abu Nu’aim, Ibn Abbas said: ‘It was revealed concerning Ali.’”

The answer to the above is from many angles:

Firstly: The word as-Siddiq (the truthful and one who accepts the truth) is an intensifier to the word as-Sadiq (the truthful), so all Siddiq is a Sadiq and not all Sadiq is Siddiq. It was established through many evidences that Abubakar is as-Siddiq and thus without any doubt the verse has encompassed him. Nay, that the verse has encompassed him is foremost than its encompassment of other companions. If we are with him and we have accepted his Caliphate, then we reject to accept that Ali deserved to be the Caliph instead of him. Therefore, what the verse teaches is contrary to what they desired.

Secondly: We say that this verse was revealed on the story of Ka’ab bin Malik when he stayed back from going to the battle of Tabuk and he told the Prophet (s.aw) the truth that he has no relevant excuse for staying back at home and Allah forgave him due to his truthfulness. In a sound hadith it is narrated ‘Abdullah bin Ka’ab: ***“I heard Ka’b bin Malik talking about the story of the battle of Tabuk when he remained behind, ‘By Allah, I do not know anyone whom Allah has helped for telling the truth more than me since I mentioned that truth to Allah’s Apostle till today, I have never intended to tell a lie. And Allah revealed to His Apostle: ‘Verily! Allah has forgiven the Prophet, the***

Muhajirin..... O you who believe! Be afraid of Allah, and be with those who are true (in words and deeds)” (9.117-119).

Thirdly: This verse was revealed concerning this story and there is nobody who is called infallible, neither Ali nor any other person. Thus, it is known that the words of Allah: **“and be with those who are true (in words and deeds)” (9.119)**, is not conditional upon being infallible.

Fourthly: The words of Allah: **“and be with those who are true (in words and deeds)” (9.119)**, come in plural form and Ali is a single person and thus the verse did not mean him alone.

Fifthly: The words of Allah: **“and be with those who are true (in words and deeds)” (9.119)**, either means be with them in telling the truth and do not be with liars, in a similar manner where Allah the Most High said: **“And perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and Irka' (i.e. bow down or submit yourselves with obedience to Allah) along with ArRaki'un (with those who bow down)” (2:43)**. Or it means: Be with the truthful in everything even if it is not hinged upon the truth. The second option is false, for it is not compulsory to be with the truthful on allowed optional acts, such as eating, drinking, and clothing etc., thus if the first option is correct, it does not mean that believers shall be with a particular person, nay what it teaches is: Be truthful and do not tell lies.

Sixthly: If it is intended by the words of Allah: **“and be with those who are true (in words and deeds)” (9.119)**, to be a general command; then that is because truthfulness is hinged upon all acts of righteousness. It come in sound hadith: 'Abdullah reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: ***“It is obligatory for you to tell the truth, for truth leads to virtue and virtue leads to Paradise, and the man who continues to speak the truth and endeavours to tell the truth is eventually recorded as truthful with Allah, and beware of telling of a lie for telling of a lie leads to obscenity and obscenity leads to Hell-Fire, and the person who keeps telling lies and endeavours to tell a lie is recorded as a liar with Allah” (Bukhari, Muslim)***. Therefore, this is an

established trait to whoever maintained truth and are true (in words and deeds).

Seventhly: Let us assume that the verse means you shall be with the person who is known to be truthful. This knowledge is like the knowledge mentioned by Allah the Most High in His Words: **“...O you who believe! When believing women come to you as emigrants, examine them, Allah knows best as to their Faith, then if you ascertain that they are true believers, send them not back to the disbelievers...” (60:60)**. Belief is more latent than truthfulness. If it is rejected (or prohibited) to say with regard to this knowledge: Only knowledge of the infallible is acceptable. In the same manner it is rejected (or prohibited) to say: Nothing can be identified except the truthfulness of the infallible.

Eighthly: If it is assumed that, what is intended is the infallible. We reply that, we do not accept the negation of infallibility on other than Ali, as explained in the preceding segments. This is because many people who are better than Shia Rafidah are claiming for their Sheikhs what entailed infallibility even though they have changed the expressions. Furthermore we do not accept the negation of infallibility from the three Caliphs as per as his infallibility is maintained. Nay, we either negate all or we affirm all.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BOWING DOWN TO ALLAH PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The thirty sixth evidence: The words of Allah the most High: **“And perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and Irka' (i.e. bow down or submit yourselves with obedience to Allah) along with ArRaki'un (those who bowed down)” (2:43).** Abu Nu’aim narrated from Ibn Abbas: ‘It was revealed concerning the Prophet (s.a.w) and especially Ali. They are the first to pray and bow down (in submission to Allah).’ this proves his virtue and his being the leader after the Prophet.”

The answer is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We do not accept that this hadith is sound and he never mentions any proof to show that it is sound.

Secondly: This is a fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: What is intended is to bow with them (in submission to Allah), the obligation will have ceased by their death. Thus, nobody is commanded to bow down with those who bow down (for they no longer exist).

Fourthly: His opinion that Ali is the first person who prayed with the Prophet (s.a.w) is rejected. Nay, most of the people (scholars) have differed with him on this and they maintained that Abubakar has prayed before him.

Fifthly: (If we assume that it is sound, then) it is a command to bow down with him, it does not mean that he is the leader of whoever bow down with him; certainly Ali is not the leader of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he used to bow down with him.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF APPOINTING A HELPER PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The thirty seventh evidence: The words of Allah: **‘And appoint for me a helper from my family’ (20:19)**. Abu Nu’aim recorded that Ibn Abbas said: ‘The Prophet (s.a.w) took the hand of Ali and my hand while we are in Makka and he prayed four units of prayer. Then, he raised his hands to the Heavens and said: ‘O Allah! Moses bin Imram (a.s) asked you and I am Muhammad Your Apostle asking You to open my chest, loose the knot from my tongue so that they understood my speech and appoint for me a helper from my family; Ali bin Abi Talib my brother, let him share my task.’ Ibn Abbas said: ‘I heard an announcer announcing; O Ahmad! Your prayers are granted.’ This is a text (proof) on this issue.”

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration to be proven.

Secondly: Certainly, this is a fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Nay, this is one of the most foolish and reckless lies against the Messenger of Allah.

Thirdly: Abdullah bin Abbas was not born during most of the period that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) spent in Makka calling people to Islam. Ibn Abbas was born during the period when Banu Hashim suffered economic and social blockade in Shi’ab.^[184] When the Prophet (s.a.w) migrated to Madina, Ibn Abbas was still a child and he is not among those who perform ablution and pray with the Prophet (s.a.w). At the time when the Prophet (s.a.w) died he (Ibn Abbas) has not yet reached the age of puberty.

Fourthly: We have already mentioned the falsity of this type of hadith from many perspectives, but in this hadith he made many additions which he did not mention before, which is: **“And let him share my task of (of Prophethood)” (20:32)**. Thus, they (Shia) explicitly stated here that Ali is his partner in his Prophethood. This is the belief of those who believe that he is a prophet (among the Shia) and this is clear unbelief. It is not a belief of Shia Imamiyyah (i.e.

Zaidiyyah), but it is a belief of Shia extremists.^[185] (According to this Shia belief) his being his partner in Prophethood is not the same as his being his successor; they are claiming that he is his successor after him and his partner in Prophethood while he is alive. This Rafidi the liar is saying: "And this is a text (proof) on this issue." We say to him: This fabricated text is saying that Ali is his partner in the task of Prophethood during his life time, in the like manner that Aaron (a.s) is a partner to Moses (a.s) during his life time. Are you saying this by the provision of the text? Or you are referring in your arguments to lies of fabricators and the garbage of your brothers the falsifiers?

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF BROTHERS FACING EACH OTHER IN PARADISE PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The thirty eighth evidence: The words of Allah: **‘And We shall remove from their breasts any sense of injury (that they may have), (So they will be like) brothers facing each other on thrones’ (15:47)**. From Musnad of Ahmad, with its chain of authority to Zaid bin Abi ‘Aufa who said: ‘I entered before the Prophet (s.a.w) in his mosque. He mentioned the story of making bond of brotherhood, and Ali said: “certainly, my soul was distressed and my back was overburdened when you did that with your companions (and avoided me). If you did that because Allah is angry with me, then to you belongs the good end result and honor.’ The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘By the One Who sent me with the truth as a Prophet, you are unto me as Aaron (a.s) is to Moses (a.s) except that there is no Prophet after me. You are my brother and my heir. You will be with me in my palace in paradise together with my daughter Fatima. Thus, you are a brother and a companion. Then the Prophet (s.a.w) recited the verse: **‘And We shall remove from their breasts any sense of injury (that they may have), (So they will be like) brothers facing each other on thrones’ (15:47)**. Meaning those who love each other for the sake of Allah, facing each other. Brotherhood leads to correlation and similarity. Since Ali is exclusively made the brother of the Prophet (s.a.w), it entailed that he shall be the leader.”

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of its chain of narrators and this hadith is not in Musnad Ahmad. Imam Ahmad has never narrated it, neither in his Musnad nor in his book al-Fada’il. His son also did not add it. Therefore, the statement of this Rafidi: “From Musnad Ahmad,” is a lie and slander against the Musnad. This hadith is in the additions made by al-Qutai’i and his additions contained a lot of lied, fabricated, spurious hadiths, which have been agreed upon by scholars of hadith as fabricated, lied narrations. Al-

Qutai'i narrated it from Abdullah bin Abdulaziz al-Bagawi, from Husain bin Muhammad az-Zari', from Abdulmunin bin Abbad, from Yazid bin Ma'an, from Abdullah bin Sharhabil, from Yazid bin Ali 'Aufa (in the book al-fada'il).

This Rafidi did not quote the conclusive part of the hadith (because it nullifies his beliefs) for in that part it states: "You are my brother and successor (heir). He (Ali) asked: 'What will I inherit from you, O Messenger of Allah?' He replied: 'What the Prophets before me left as inheritance.' He asked again: 'What did the Prophets before you left as inheritance?' He replied: 'The Book of Allah and Sunnah of their Prophets.'" The chain of narration of this hadith is darkness. It was exclusively narrated by one person called Abdulmunin bin Abbad who is among the disparaged reporters, and was judged weak by Abu Hatim. He reported it from Yazid bin Mu'in, who is unknown and may be this unknown person is the one who fabricated it and put it on the lips of Abdullah bin Shurahbil, who is also unknown, from a man (unknown) from the Quraish, on the authority of Yazid bin Aufa.

Secondly: This is a lied fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Thirdly: All the hadiths of making bond of brotherhood between the Muhajirun and the Muhajirun and between Ansar and Ansar are fabricated lies. The Prophet (s.a.w) never made Ali his brother, he never made Abubakar and Umar brothers and he never made a Muhajir and Muhajir brothers. But he made bond of brotherhood between muhajirun and Ansar i.e. he established bond of brotherhood between Abdurrahman bin 'Auf and Sa'ad bin Rabi', between Salman al-Farisi and Abu Darda' and between Ali bin Abi Talib and Sahal bin Hanif. Establishing the bond of brotherhood took place in the compound of Banu Najjar and this was reported by Anas bin Malik in sound hadiths. Thus, it did not take place in the Prophet's mosque as mentioned in the fabricated hadith.

Fourthly: The statement in this fabricated hadith: "You are my brother and heir," is false to both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia, for if they mean by that inheritance of wealth; they have negated and nullified their

statement in which they say: Fatima is his heir. Furthermore how can a cousin inherit him while his uncle Abbas is still alive? What did he make him specifically to inherit from him to the exclusion of all his cousins who are of the same status with Ali? If they say, they mean by that: Inheritor of knowledge and authority! Their arguments are nullified by the words of Allah: **“And Sulaiman (Solomon) inherited (the knowledge of) Dawud (David). He said: "O mankind! We have been taught the language of birds, and on us have been bestowed all things. This, verily, is an evident grace (from Allah)” (27:16).** And the words of Allah the Most high: **“And Verily! I fear my relatives after me, since my wife is barren. So give me from Yourself an heir, ‘Who shall inherit me, and inherit (also) the posterity of Ya'qub (Jacob) (inheritance of the religious knowledge and Prophethood, not the wealth, etc.). And make him, my Lord, one with whom You are Well-pleased!” (19:5-6).** This is because the word “inheritance” can take this or that meaning, thus it is possible that those Prophets are inherited in the manner that Ali inherited the Prophet (s.a.w).

Ahlus Sunnah knew that the knowledge that the Prophet (s.a.w) left is not exclusive (inheritance) of Ali. Nay, all his companions have taken knowledge from him relatively and knowledge is not like wealth and therefore, what this person inherits cannot be inherited by that person and they do not compete with each other for it. It is possible that what this person knew is also known by that person, in contrast to wealth that has been taken by this person (as inheritance), it cannot be taken by that person.

Fifthly: Certainly, the prophet (s.a.w) has established brotherhood with other than Ali. It come in sound hadith that he said to Zaid: **“You are our brother and our freed slave” (Bukhari).** In another sound hadith which has been narrated by 'Ursa: **“The Prophet asked Abubakar for Aisha's hand in marriage. Abubakar said ‘But I am your brother.’ The Prophet said, ‘You are my brother in Allah's religion and His Book, but she (Aisha) is lawful for me to marry” (Bukhari).** In a sound hadith when the Prophet (s.a.w) was speaking concerning the right of Abubakar he said: **“... The person**

who has favored me most of all both with his company and wealth, is Abubakar. If I were to take a Khalil (intimate friend) other than my Lord, I would have taken Abubakar as such, but (what relates us) is the Islamic brotherhood and friendliness. All the gates of the Mosque should be closed except the gate of Abubakar” (Bukhari). These hadiths and other ones could be found in the books of Sihah (sound books of hadiths). Therefore, since the matter is as mentioned, brotherhood do not entail similarity in all angles and it does not entail correlation and similitude in all facets, nay but in some areas.

If the matter is as mentioned, when it is said: Since making brotherhood between the Prophet (s.a.w) and Ali is sound, it entailed his precedence (being the best) and being the leader, although brotherhood with the Prophet (s.a.w) is a shared virtue (not exclusive to Ali). It comes in many sound hadiths that the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning Abubakar: **“... Abubakar has favored me much with his property and company. If I were to take a Khalil (intimate, bosom friend) from mankind I would certainly have taken Abu Bakr but the Islamic brotherhood and friendship is sufficient. Close all the gates in the mosque except that of Abu Bakr” (Bukhari, Muslim).** This hadith has established some specific, exclusive traits of Abubakar which have not been shared by anyone else with him. It is clear and distinct that nobody among the people of the world is more beloved to him than Abubakar; nobody has greater status than him, nobody has greater estimation than him and nobody is closer to him among all his companions. [\[186\]](#)

It come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) says the most beloved person to him among men is Abubakar. Narrated 'Amr bin Al-As: **The Prophet deputed me to read the Army of Dhat-as-Salasil. I came to him and said, ‘Who is the most beloved person to you?’ He said, ‘Aisha.’ I asked, ‘Among the men?’ He said, ‘Her father.’ I said, ‘Who then?’ He said, ‘Then 'Umar bin Al-Khattab.’ He then named other men” (Bukhari).** It also comes in sound hadith that Umar said to Abubakar: **“... No but we elect you, for you are our chief and the best amongst us and the**

most beloved of all of us to Allah's Apostle" (Bukhari, Muslim).

[187] These are hadiths the soundness of which have been agreed upon by scholars of hadith and nobody among them have faulted any of it. Therefore, it is clear that Abubakar is the most beloved to him and is greater in status and estimation to him than all people.

Thus if making bond of friendship is lesser than this status, it does not contradict it and if it is greater, all these sound hadiths proved that the hadith of making bond of friendship between the Prophet (s.a.w) and Ali are lies and fabrications; although we knew that they are false even without making this comparison. What we aimed at is that these sound hadiths explained that Abubakar is the most beloved person to the Prophet (s.a.w) and that he has higher status and estimation to the Prophet (s.a.w) than anyone else. There are many hadiths testifying to what we have mentioned. Certainly more than eighty-five men have narrated that Ali bin Abi Talib has said from the top of his pulpit in Kufa: ***"The best of this community after its Prophet (s.a.w) is Abubakar, then Umar" (Bukhari).*** The son of Ali, Muhammad bin Ali (popularly called Ibn Hanafiyyah) narrated that: ***"I asked my father (Ali bin Abi Talib), 'Who are the best people after Allah's Apostle?' He said, 'Abubakar.' I asked, 'Who then?' He said, 'Then 'Umar.' I was afraid he would say 'Uthman, so I said, 'Then you?' He said, 'I am only an ordinary person' (Bukhari).***

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF TESTIFYING PROVES LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The thirty ninth evidence: The words of Allah: **'And (remember) when your Lord brought forth from the Children of Adam, from their loins, their seed (or from Adam's loin his offspring) and made them testify as to themselves (saying): 'Am I not your Lord?' They said: 'Yes! We testify,' lest you should say on the Day of Resurrection: "Verily, we have been unaware of this' (7:127).** It come in the book al-Firdaus by Ibn Shirweih that Huzaifa bin Yaman said the Prophet (s.a.w) says: 'If people know the time when Ali was named commander of the faithful's they will not deny his virtues. He was named commander of the faithful's while Adam is in the state of being between soul and body and Allah said: **'And (remember) when your Lord brought forth from the Children of Adam, from their loins, their seed (or from Adam's loin his offspring) and made them testify as to themselves (saying): 'Am I not your Lord?' They said: 'Yes! We testify,' lest you should say on the Day of Resurrection: "Verily, we have been unaware of this' (7:127).** The Angels said, 'Yes! We bear witness to that.' Allah said (to them): 'I am Your Lord, Muhammad is your Prophet, and Ali is your leader.' This is a very clear text on this issue (leadership of Ali).

The answer to the claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We rejected its soundness and demanded that it be proven. Scholars of hadith have had consensus that a mere narration by the author of al-Firdaus do not imply that the hadith is sound. Ibn Shirweih al-Dulaimi al-Hamdani has mentioned many sound and good hadiths in this book, but he also recorded many fabricated hadiths. This, although he is a religious man and a scholar and he is not a person that lies, but he compiled his book from copying from many people's books that contained both sound and fabricated hadiths. He therefore, did what many scholars have done while

compiling hadiths: With chain of authority and without chain of authority; and the sound, the weak and the fabricated.

Secondly: This hadith is a lied fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars.

Thirdly: What has been encompassed by the words of Allah: **‘Am I not your Lord?’ They said: ‘Yes! We testify,’** there is neither mention in it of the Prophet (s.a.w) nor the commander of the faithful’s and it contained: **“Or lest you should say: ‘It was only our fathers aforetime who took others as partners in worship along with Allah, and we were (merely their) descendants after them; will You then destroy us because of the deeds of men who practiced Al-Batil (i.e. polytheism)’” (17:173).** This showed that it is specifically talking about Tauhid (Oneness of Allah); it does not contain covenant about Prophethood, let alone what is less than Prophethood!

Fourthly: All the known hadiths concerning this issue that are recorded in Musnad, Sunans, Muwatta, and the books of exegesis of the Qur’an etc., does not contain what is mentioned in this hadith and if it is sound all those scholars will not neglect it to the extent that it is only mentioned by a man whose reliability is not known. Nay, who is known to be a liar!

Fifthly: Certainly the covenant was taken by all children of Adam, and thus (the above fabricated hadith) entailed that Ali is the leader of all Prophets right from Noah (a.s) to Muhammad (s.a.w) and this a statement of mad men; for those people have died before Ali is created. Then, how can he be their leader? The utmost limit of what can be said is that he is the leader of the people of his time, but being the leader of those who are created before him and those who are created after his death is a lie. This type of lie can only be made by the person who does not know what he is saying and do not feel shame about telling lies!

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF ALLAH IS HIS PROTECTOR PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The fortieth evidence: The words of Allah the Most high: ‘... **But if you help one another against him, then verily, Allah is his Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.), and Gabriel, and the righteous among the believers, and furthermore, the angels are his helpers**’ (66:4). All exegetist of the Qur’an have had consensus that what is meant by ‘**righteous among the believers,**’ in the verse is Ali bin Abi Talib. Abu Nu’aim narrated from Asma’ bint Umais who said: ‘I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) reciting this verse: ‘... **But if you help one another against him, then verily, Allah is his Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.), and Gabriel, and the righteous among the believers, and furthermore, the angels are his helpers**’ (66:4). And he said: ‘**righteous among the believers,**’ is Ali bin Abi Talib.’ His being exclusive with this trait showed that he is the best and therefore he shall be the leader. There are many more verses proving that Ali shall be the leader after the Prophet (s.a.w), but we stop here for the purpose of being brief.”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives:

Firstly: His statement: “All the exegetists of the Qur’an have had consensus that what is meant by the righteous among the believers in the verse is Ali bin Abi Talib.” This is a clear lie for they never agreed upon what he has mentioned and nobody has mentioned the consensus among the exegetists of the Qur’an or scholars of hadith etc.: Who among them mention this consensus?

Secondly: The books of the exegesis of the Qur’an are full with what is contrary to what he has mentioned. Abdullah bin Mas’ud, Ikrimah, Mujahid, Dhahak and other scholars mentioned that it is Abubakar and Umar. This statement was recorded by many exegetists such as Ibn Jarir at-Tabari.

Thirdly: The statement that made the verse exclusive to Ali has not been made by anybody whose opinion has weight and the hadith

that has been mentioned is spurious and fabricated lie. This Rafidi did not mention what proves its soundness and a mere recording of a hadith by Abu Nu'aim does not make it sound.

Fourthly: The words of Allah the Most High: **righteous among the believers** (صَالِحُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ), is a collective noun that encompasses all righteous believers. It comes in sound hadith as follows: Narrated 'Amr bin Al-'As: I heard the Prophet saying openly not secretly, ***“The family of Abu so-and-so are not among my protectors.... My Protector is Allah and the righteous believing people”*** (Bukhari, Muslim).

Fifthly: Certainly, Allah the Most High has made by the instructions of this verse, the righteous among the believers to be the supports, aids and the protectors of the Prophet (s.a.w), in the same manner in which He mentioned that He is his aid and protector. Therefore, it is untenable to interpret it as somebody who has authority over him (the Prophet) and thus, its meaning is supporters and protectors.

With regard to the Rafidi's statement: "There are many more verses showing that Ali shall be the leader after the Prophet (s.a.w), but we stop here for the purpose of being brief."

We reply that: The utmost limit is that what he has left (without mentioning) is similar to what he has mentioned (of so-called proofs and evidences from the Qur'an) and what he has mentioned is a summary of what they possessed. The door of lies cannot be closed and that is why some people face their lies with what they can be able to present of lies. Nay, Allah always fling (send down) the truth against the falsehood, so it destroys it, and behold, it (falsehood) is vanished. And woe to the liars for that (lie) which they ascribe to Allah.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF DECLARING THE MESSAGE OF ALLH PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: The third methodology is on the evidences that relied on Sunnah that has been transmitted from the Prophet (s.a.w) and they are twelve:

The first evidence is what all the scholars have transmitted when Allah the Most High revealed: **“And warn your tribe (O Muhammad) of near kindred” (26:214).** The Prophet (s.a.w) invited Banu Abdul Mutallib in the house of Abi Talib, and they are forty men and he commanded that a leg of mutton, a measure of wheat and milk should be prepared for them. Each one of them ate and drank until he is satisfied at that sitting. They were informed of the small measure of food that satisfied all of them and they became surprised and by that the signs of his Prophethood became clear to them. This is because many among them can be able to consume a whole torso of a ram and drink a complete large pitcher of milk (or water). Then he said to them: ‘O Banu Abdulmutallib! ‘Certainly, Allah has sent me with the truth to all people and He sent me to you specifically with His command: **“And warn your tribe (O Muhammad SAW) of near kindred” (26:214).** And I am inviting you to two light words on the tongue but heavy on the scale, by which you will be given authority over the Arabs and the none Arabs, by which all nations will submit to your authority and by which you will enter Paradise and escape from Hell-Fire: To bear witness that there is no body worthy of being worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is his Messenger. So who among you will accept my call on this issue and assist me in this mission so that he became my brother, my assistant, my legatee, my heir and my successor after me?’ Nobody responded to him. But Ali said: ‘O Prophet! I will assist you.’ The Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: ‘Sit down.’ He repeated his statement to the people three times and each time Ali is the only person who will stand up and repeat his acceptance. At last, the Prophet said to him: ‘You are my brother, my assistant, my legatee,

my heir and my successor after me.' All the people stood up and told Abu Talib with smirk: Congratulation to you today you have embraced the religion of your cousin and he has made your son a leader over you.'"

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration. His claim that all people have narrated this hadith is a clear lie, which is identified as lie by the scholars of hadith and its sciences. Certainly, this hadith cannot be found in any reliable books of hadith such as Sihah, Sunan, Masanid, Maghazi (history of war campaigns) and exegesis of the Qur'an in which chains of authorities are mentioned and which can be accepted as evidence. If it is found in some exegesis of the Qur'an where both sound, weak and fabricated hadiths are recorded, such as exegesis of the Qur'an by Tha'alabi, Wahidi, and Baghawi and even that of Ibn Jarir at-Tabari and Abu Hatim: A mere narration in the book of any of those scholars does not prove that it is sound by the consensus of scholars. If one knows that those books contained both sound, weak and fabricated hadith; then, it must be explained that this hadith is sound or weak or fabricated.

Secondly: We will accept the hadith from him under one of the following conditions: Either by mentioning a chain of authority which is accepted by scholars of hadith on issues that are being contended, even if it is an issue under branches of religion or by a statement from a man among the scholars of hadith who are relied upon. Certainly, if two jurists debate an issue pertaining to a branch of religious observances, evidence will not be established on the issue except with a hadith that has chain of authority that is sound and reliable and thus, can be accepted as a proof or a hadith that has been declared sound by a scholar of hadith who is an authority and who is referred to on the matter. But if the chain of authority of a hadith is not known and scholars of hadith did not accept it; from where can its soundness be ascertained? This, especially on a principle of religion which is based on disparaging the predecessors and the generality of the Muslim community, with the intent of

demolishing the pillars of Islam. Then, in such a situation, how can we accept a hadith that is devoid of chain of authority? It is a hadith which scholars of hadith have not accepted and none of them has declared it sound!

Thirdly: This hadith is a lied spurious, fabricated narration. All scholars of hadith knew that it is false and that is why they did not narrate it in their books that are referred to for sound narrations. Whoever has limited knowledge of hadith and its sciences knew that it is fabricated.

Fourthly: Banu Abdulmutallab are not up to forty men when this verse was revealed at Makka at the beginning of the Islamic mission. Nay, they did not reach up to forty men throughout the period of the Prophet (s.a.w).

Fifthly: Concerning what the Rafidi stated above: "This is because many among them can be able to consume a whole torso of a ram and drink a pitcher of milk." This statement is a lie against them. Banu Hashim are not known to be so gluttons and nobody among them is known to be able to eat a whole torso of ram and drink a whole pitcher of milk.

Sixthly: Their (Shia Rafida) claim that the Prophet (s.a.w) addressed the assembly saying: "Who will harken to my call and assist me in my mission and be my brother, my assistant, my legatee, my heir and my successor after me?" This is a fabricated statement against the Prophet (s.a.w) and it is prohibited to ascribe it to him. Certainly, a mere accepting of the two testimonies (belief in Allah and his messenger) and supporting that mission does not necessitate all these things. Surely all believers have accepted the two testimonies and aided the Prophet in his mission; they sacrificed their lives, exerted their efforts and spent their wealth in order to establish Islam and obey the Prophet. In the course of doing so, they left their homes and became enemies to their brothers. They were patient with separation after intimacy, humiliation after honor, destitution after affluence and hardship after ease.

Their history is famous and well known; but with all these sacrifices, nobody among them became his successor (automatically or by

direct appointment). Furthermore, if he has made this offer to forty men and they all accepted his offer, - or most of them or a number of them – so, if a number of them accepted his offer, who among them will be his successor after him?

Seventhly: Certainly, Hamza, Ja'afar and Ubaid bin Harith (who are also his relatives) have accepted what Ali has accepted of the two testimonies and aiding the Prophet (s.a.w) in his mission.

Eighthly: This is not what has been reported in sound hadith concerning the revelation of this verse. It was narrated that Allah's Apostle got up when the Verse: **“And warn your tribe of near kindred....” (26.214)** was revealed he invited all the Quraish tribes and they gathered around him. He spoke to them bot specifically and generally saying: ***“O Quraish people! (or he said a similar word) Buy yourselves! I cannot save you from Allah (if you disobey Him) O Bani Abu Manaf! I cannot save you from Allah (if you disobey Him). O 'Abbas! The son of 'Abdul Muttalib! I cannot save you from Allah (if you disobey Him) O Safiya, (the aunt of Allah's Apostle) I cannot save you from Allah (if you disobey Him). O Fatima, the daughter of Muhammad ! Ask what you wish from my property, but I cannot save you from Allah (if you disobey Him)” (Bukhari, Muslim).***[\[188\]](#)

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE FALSITY OF THE ARGUMENTS OF THE RAFIDI WITH THE HADITH OF GHADIR KHUM

The Rafidi stated: “The second evidence: The concurrent hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w) when the verse was revealed to him: **“O Messenger (Muhammad SAW)! Proclaim (the Message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord. And if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message. Allah will protect you from mankind. Verily, Allah guides not the people who disbelieve” (5:67).** He made a sermon in Ghadir Khum and said to all people: ‘O you people! Am I not closer to you than yourselves? They replied: ‘Nay, you are!’ Then he said: ‘Whoever beloved friend I am, Ali also is his beloved friend. O Allah befriend whoever befriend him and be hostile to whoever is hostile to him and aid whoever support him and abandon whoever forsake him.’ Umar said: ‘Bravo! You have become my beloved friend and the beloved friend of believers, men and women.’ What is meant by ‘Maula’ here is the person in charge with authority because he has strengthened and affirmed it with his words: ‘Am I not closer to you than yourselves?’ [\[189\]](#)

We reply that: We have already given answer with regard to this verse. We have explained that it is a lie and that the verse: **“O Messenger (Muhammad)! Proclaim (the Message) which has been sent down to you from your Lord. And if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message. Allah will protect you from mankind. Verily, Allah guides not the people who disbelieve” (5:67),** was revealed long ago before the farewell pilgrimage. Thus, it is understood that there isn’t any law that has been revealed on the day of Ghadir Khum, neither on the rights of Ali nor on any other matter and neither on his successorship nor on any other issue. But the hadith of befriending has been narrated by Tirmidhi and Ahmad in his Musnad that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **“Whoever beloved befriend I am, Ali is also his beloved friend” (Ahmad, Tirmidhi).** With regard to the addition: “O Allah! Befriend whoever befriend him and be an enemy to whoever is an enemy to him...,” there is no

doubt that it is a lie. Also the hadith: “You are foremost to every believing man and believing woman,” is also a lie.

With regard to his words: ***“Whoever beloved friend I am, Ali also is his beloved friend.”*** This hadith is not in the books of sound hadiths (Sihah), but it is among the hadiths that was narrated by scholars and they differed on its soundness. It was reported that Bukhar and Ibrahim al-Harbi and a number of scholars faulted it and said that it is weak. It was reported that Ahmad bin Hanbal says it is a good hadith, the same verdict was given by Tirmidhi. Abul Abbas bin ‘Uqdah has written a book in which he gathered all its sources and chains of authorities.

We hereby answer the above claim with a compound answer saying: If the Prophet (s.a.w) did not make that statement; the matter is closed. And if he has stated that; certainly he does not mean successorship after him, because there is nothing in the statement which showed that. It is obligatory to explain this type of grand issue clearly and distinctly. There is nothing in the statement which showed clearly, and without any ambiguity what is intended is the Caliphate. This is because the word “Maula” (المولى) is like “Wali” (الولي) and Allah the Most High has said: **“Verily, your Wali (Protector or Helper) is Allah, His Messenger, and the believers, - those who perform As-Salat (Iqamat-as-Salat), and give Zakat, and they bow down (submit themselves with obedience to Allah in prayer)” (5:55).** And He the Most Exalted said: **“...then verily, Allah is his Maula (Lord, or Master, or Protector, etc.), and Gabriel, and the righteous among the believers, and furthermore, the angels are his helpers” (66:4).** It thus, explained that the Prophet (s.a.w) is the “Wali,” of believers and that they are his “Mawali” (Sing. Maula – protector, patron, client, friend, companion, associate etc.) also. It also explained that Allah is “Wali,” of believers and they are His “Awliya” (أولياء) – plu. of “Wali;” helper, supporter, benefactor, sponsor, close associate etc. and it also explained that believers are “Awliya,” to each other. Therefore, “Muwala” – friendship - (الموالة) is opposite of “Mu’adat” – be hostile to each other, be enemies – (المعاداة); and they are established from

both sides although One of the befriended is greater in status and His friendship is grace, favor and beneficence and friendship of the other is obedience and worship. In the same manner, Allah loves believers and believers loves Him. Allah is “Wali,” friend of believers and He is their “Maula,” Protector and Aid, and He takes them out of darkness to light. If the matter is as stated; then, the meaning of Allah is the “Wali” of believers and their “Maula,” That the Prophet (s.a.w) is their ‘Wali” and “Maula,” and Ali is their “Maula,” is the “Muwala,” (friendship) which is opposite and contrary to “Mu’adat,” (harboring enmity). The believers “Yatawallauna (يتولون) –take as friends,” - Allah and His messenger (s.a.w) and friendship is contrary to enmity and this is an established law for every believer and therefore, Ali is among the believers and that is he is befriended by them and he befriend them.

Summarily the difference between “Wali” and “Maula” and similar words and “Waali” (يوال) on the issue of “Wilaya,” which is opposite of enmity – is an issue which is different from the issue of “Wilaya,” which is related to the issue of power and authority. The hadith is talking about the first issue and not the second issue and the Prophet (s.a.w) did not say: “Whoever I am his leader (موالي), then Ali is also his leader (موالي), the expression of the hadith is: “Whoever I am his friend (Maulahu), then Ali is his friend (Maulahu).” Turning the word “Mawla,” to mean ‘Waali (يوال)” – leader - is false and untenable.

Certainly, ‘Wilaya,” (friendship) is established between two parties; surely believer are ‘Awliya” (friends of Allah) and He is their “Maula” (friend). With regard to the Prophet (s.a.w) being closer “Awla” (أول) to the believer than themselves; then, know that, that can only be established from his side (from one side or one party) and his being closer to every believer than himself is of the exclusive qualities of his Prophethood.^[190]

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH YOU ARE UNTO ME AS AARON IS TO MOSES PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The third evidence: The Prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali: ***‘You are unto me as Aaron (a.s) is to Moses (a.s), except that there is no prophet after me.’*** He affirmed for him all the statuses of Aaron (a.s) with the exception of Prophethood. Among the statuses is that Aaron would have succeeded Moses (a.s) while he is alive and if he has live longer than him, he would have been his successor otherwise that will entail infraction from his side. This is because he was his successor while he exist, during his absence and therefore after his death and long span of absence it is foremost that he succeed him.”

We reply to the above that: This hadith is certainly sound and it is narrated in the Sahihain and other reliable sources. The Prophet (s.a.w) said that to him at the campaign of Tabuk: Whenever the Prophet (s.a.w) travel outside Madina for a battle or a campaign or for lesser pilgrimage or for major pilgrimage he used to appoint somebody to succeed him in Madina (oversee its affairs until he come back). He appointed Uthman as his successor in Madina when he went for the battle of Dhi-‘Amr. He appointed Bashir bin Abdulmunzir to succeed him in Madina when he went for the battle of Bani Qainiqa,’ and he appointed Ibn Umm Makhtum to succeed him over Madina when he went after Quraish and he reached al-Fur’u; all these have been mentioned by Ibn Sa’ad and other historians.

Summarily it is well known that the Prophet (s.a.w) never travelled out of Madina without appointing somebody to succeed him in it and Muslim historians have mentioned the people he used to appoint to succeed him. He has certainly, travelled for the two lesser pilgrimages; that of Hudabiyyah and that of Qada (fulfillment). And during the farewell pilgrimage and during all his military campaigns – more than twenty battles – and on each occasion he will appoint

somebody to oversee Madina and there used to be a lot of men in the town whenever he appointed somebody to succeed him. But during the battle of Tabuk the Prophet (s.a.w) did not give anybody permission to stay back in Madina and it was his last battle. The Prophet (s.a.w) left nobody in Madina except women, children, and those who are exempted due to sickness (or old age), the hypocrites and three men who stayed back but are latter on forgiven by Allah. At that time there are no believing men who can be governed (in Madina) like in other similar occasions and this is a weak successorship if compared with the past occasions and appointments. At all past times the people who are left in Madina are better than those who are left behind during the battle of Tabuk and therefore, all past successorship are better than this one and that is why Ali went out to the Prophet (s.a.w) crying and saying: ***“Do you make me your successor over women and children?”*** It come as follows: ***Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) left 'Ali bin Abi Talib behind him (as he proceeded) to the expedition of Tabuk, whereupon he ('Ali) said: Allah's Messenger, are you leaving me behind amongst women and children? Thereupon he (the Holy Prophet) said: Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses but with this exception that there would be no prophet after me” (Bukhar, Muslim).***

This deputizing or successorship (of Ali) is not like the successorship of Aaron (a.s) because all the people are with Aaron (a.s), for Moses (a.s) went alone (to meet his Lord). In contrast to the successorship of Ali over Madina, for the Prophet (s.a.w) went with all the men and nobody is left in Madina except women, children, the infirm (due to sickness or old age) and the disobedient men.

When somebody says: “This is of that status, or this is similar to that,” is just like comparing something with something and the meaning will be discerned from the context of the expression and it never entailed sameness or exactness in everything. Don't you consider what has been established in sound hadiths regarding the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w), when he sought their advise

concerning war captives; Abubakar advised that ransom shall be collected, while Umar advised that they shall be killed. The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“I will inform you about your two companions. The similitude of you O Abubakar is like Abraham (a.s) when he said: ‘O my Lord! They have indeed led astray many among mankind. But whoso follows me, he verily is of me. And whoso disobeys me, - still You are indeed Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful’ (14:36). And similar to Jesus (a.s) when he said: ‘If You punish them, they are Your slaves, and if You forgive them, verily You, only You are the AllMighty, the AllWise’ (5:118). The similitude of you O Umar like Noah when he said: ‘And Nuh (Noah) said: “My Lord! Leave not one of the disbelievers on the earth!” (71:26). And like Moses (a.s) when he said: ‘... Our Lord! Destroy their wealth, and harden their hearts, so that they will not believe until they see the painful torment’ (10:88).***

The Prophet’s statement, this is like Abraham (a.s) and Jesus (a.s) and that is like Noah (a.s) and Moses (a.s) is greater than his statement: ***“You are unto me as Moses (a.s) is to Aaron (a.s).”*** certainly, Noah (a.s), Abraham (a.s), Moses (a.s) and Jesus (a.s) are greater than Aaron (a.s). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) made those two similar to those Prophets, but he does not mean that they are similar to them in everything, except by trait which is shown by the context of the hadith of (this one) being strict for the sake of Allah and (that one) being lenient for the sake of Allah.

The same measure is applied here: He is of the status of Aaron (a.s) according to what the context of the hadith has indicated, and that is Ali’s successorship over Madina when the Prophet (s.a.w) is away from it (for the battle of Tabuk), in the same manner that Moses (a.s) appointed Aaron (a.s) to succeed him when he went to meet his Lord. This successorship (or appointment to oversee Madina when the prophet is absent), is not an exclusive virtue of Ali, it is not even like other appointment made by the Prophet (s.a.w) over Madina, let alone being better than them!

The Prophet’s exclusive mentioning of Ali in this context is in the sense of title and there are two types of titles: Title that is a variety

(class or type) and a title that is considered as knowledge such as Zaid and you. This meaning is the weakest sense and that is why scholars of principle (of jurisprudence) and jurisprudence mentioned that it could not be mentioned as a proof. If one say: Muhammad (s.aw) is the messenger of Allah. This did not negate that other than him are Messengers of Allah. But if there is anything in the context of the statement that entailed particularization; then the correct opinion is that it can be used as proof. Example of such instances are the words of Allah the Most High: **“And We made Solomon to understand (the case)...” (21:79)**. And the words of Allah the Most Exalted: **“Nay! Surely, they (evil-doers) will be veiled from seeing their Lord that Day” (83:15)**. Furthermore, if the particularization is due to a certain cause, then scholars have consensus that it cannot be used as a proof and this is of that type; certainly, the Prophet (s.a.w) specifically mentioned Ali because he come out to him crying and complaining that he is left behind with women and children. The other companions that have been appointed by the Prophet (s.a.w) to success him over Madina never consider or envisage that their appointment is a decrease in their status (and thus they never complain). Therefore, there is no need for him to make this type of remark concerning them. Particularization due to a cause that necessitated the mention does not entail particularization in regulation, and therefore, there is nothing in the hadith to prove that other than him are not to the Prophet (s.a.w) as Aaron (a.s) is to Moses (a.s) – for they too have been his successors over Madina while he is absent.

The statement of the Rafidi that: “He made him of the status of Aaron (a.s) in everything except Prophethood,” is false, because his words: **“Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses?”** Showed that he is trying to please him with those words and make his heart contented, because he think that appointing him to oversee Madina is a decrease in his status and thus he said those words to him as a form of soothing his feelings (and rectifying his thought).

The words of the Prophet (s.a.w): ***“Like Aaron (a.s) is to Moses (a.s).”*** It means: Like the station of Aaron, for the same station of Aaron (a.s) to Moses (a.s) cannot be transferred to anyone else, but he can be something similar to it. This is like the statement: This one is similar to this one. It is also like the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) to Abubakar, he is like Abraham (a.s) and Jesus (a.s) and to Umar, he is like Noah (a.s) and Moses (a.s).

What will make this clearer to you is that it was in the year of the battle of Tabuk, after he returned from the battle that he sent Abubakar as the leader of the pilgrimage delegation to Makka and he sent Ali after him. When Abubakar saw Ali, he asked him: “Are you coming as a leader or as follower?” Ali replied: “Nay, I am a follower!” Abubakar was his leader and Ali is among the followers; he pray behind him, obey his commands and he was announcing from behind him during the pilgrimage rites: “No polytheist shall attend the pilgrimage after this year and nobody shall circumambulate the House of Allah (Ka’abah) naked.”^[191]

The Rafidid stated: “Since he is his successor while he exist, but absent for a short period; then, after his death and long period of absence, he deserved to be his successor more than anybody else.”

We reply that: Certainly, with his existence and absence (for a short period) he has appointed other than Ali to succeed him in a greater measure than that of Ali. Those successors are made to oversee people who are better than those who Ali is made to oversee and after the battle of Tabuk he has appointed over Madina other than Ali when he went for the farewell pilgrimage. Therefore, appointing Ali over Madina does not automatically made him his successor after his death to the exclusion of other companions that have been appointed over the town at different periods and their appointments are greater than the appointment of Ali. The last appointment of the Prophet (s.a.w) to succeed him over Madina was when he went for the farewell pilgrimage and at that time Ali is in Yemen; he attended the pilgrimage with the Prophet (s.a.w) but it is somebody who was appointed to oversee Madina and not Ali. Thus, if the basis is continuation of successorship (over Madina), then the person who

was appointed during the farewell pilgrimage deserved to continue ruling as the Caliph more than the person who was appointed before that time.

Summarily, appointments to succeed the Prophet in Madina, while he is absent is not exclusive to Ali, it does not prove precedence (or being the best) and neither does it prove Imamah (leadership). Certainly, the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed many men other than Ali (to oversee the city while he is absent). Alas! Those ignorant men are turning general virtues that has been shared between Ali and other people specific only to him, even though other than him are more perfect in their successorship. They (Shia Rafidah) do the same thing with regard to the texts of Qur'an, Sunnah and events that occurred.

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI ON HIS CLAIM THAT ALI CONTINUED TO RULE MADINA UP TO THE DEATH OF THE PROPHET

The Rafidi stated: "The fourth evidence: He made him his successor over Madina while he exist, but absent for a short period. Thus, it is necessary that he succeed him after his death; by consensus nobody deserved it other than Ali. And because he did not remove him from the leadership of Madina and therefore, he shall be his successor after his death in the city. If he is his successor in Madina, he shall also be his successor outside it (over its surroundings), by consensus."

We reply that: This evidence (arguments) and similar ones are useless proofs that are of the class of the spider's web. We reply to it from many perspectives:

Firstly: We state according to one of the opinions: Certainly, he has appointed Abubakar to be his successor after his death as explained (in the preceding segments). If Shia Rafidah. Say: Nay, he appointed Ali (to succeed him). We reply: Rawundiyyah (Rawandites) of your class (a Shia sect) says he appointed Abbas (to succeed him).^[192] Whoever have knowledge of sound Sunnah, knew that the hadiths that indicated the successorship of someone after his death are all indicating the successorship of Abubakar. There is nothing in sound hadiths that indicated to the successorship of Ali or Abbas; nay all of it showed that he did not appoint anyone of them. Therefore, we say: If the Prophet has appointed anybody to succeed him, it is certainly Abubakar and if he did not appoint anybody to succeed him; then it is neither this one, nor that one.

Secondly: We say: You people (Shia Rafidah) do not accept analogy (Qiyas - deduction of law by analogy) and this is (what you are doing now) presenting argument with analogy. In this instance, you made the analogy of appointment after his death with appointment while absent. As for us (Ahlu Sunnah), if we assume one of the opinions, we can say: The differences between them is as we have explained

concerning the appointment of Umar who will succeed him during his life time and his refusal to appoint a particular person after his death. This is because the Prophet (s.a.w) is a witness to his community during his life time; he was commanded to administer it by himself or with a representative, but that responsibility is removed from him after his death. This is similar to what Jesus (a.s) has said: **“Never did I say to them aught except what You (Allah) did command me to say: 'Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.' And I was a witness over them while I dwelt amongst them, but when You took me up, You were the Watcher over them, and You are a Witness to all things. (This is a great admonition and warning to the Christians of the whole world)” (5:117).** He (Jesus) did not say: My successor is witness to them. This proved that Jesus (a.s) never appoint a successor and it further proved that Prophets are not obligated to appoint their successors after their death.^[193] It come in a sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **“... *I will then say what the Pious Slave Jesus, the son of Mary said: 'And I was a witness over them while I dwelt amongst them; when You did take me up, You were the Watcher over them, and You are a Witness to all things. If You punish them, they are Your slaves, and if you forgive them, You, only You are the All-Mighty the All-Wise.'* ” (5.117-118).**

Thirdly: We say: Appointing a representative is compulsory upon any leader – whether a Prophet or a person in charge of authority – he must appoint representatives to discharge responsibilities that he cannot be able to carry out physically: He must discharge responsibilities either by himself or through his representatives. He can discharge responsibilities that are before him, but while he is absent, he cannot be able to carry them out except through somebody that he appointed to succeed him. The person who has been appointed while the supreme leader is absent will discharge responsibilities, such as commanding them to do good and prohibiting them from doing evil, he took right from them, he punish those who transgress bounds, and he judge between them with justice. In similar manner that the Prophet (s.a.w) appoints a

representative over whatever is beyond his view. For instance, he appoint leaders to lead military campaigns and those leaders will lead them in prayer, control them and fight Jihad (against the enemies) with them. He also used to appoint governors for regions in contrast to appointing the person who will succeed him after his death. This is because he conveyed the message of his Lord to his community and it is now obligatory upon them to obey him even after his death. Thus, they can appoint their leaders by themselves in similar manner that they can appoint somebody on all communal obligations that requires to be discharged by an appointee. With this it is clear that the obligation of appointing a successor or a representative while in existence does not entail its obligation after death.

Fourthly: It is obligatory upon the supreme commander or leader to appoint successors (or representatives) to discharge many types of duties and responsibilities, in similar manner that the Prophet (s.a.w) used to appoint leaders wherever he is physically absent, so that they carry out all obligations among the subjects. It is well known that it is not obligatory upon him to make all these appointments after his death – nay, it is not even possible: Certainly he cannot be able to appoint for the Islamic community after his death, those who will take care of every responsibility; they require a leader after a leader and making such appointments is impossible.

Fifthly: Abandoning appointing his successor after his death is foremost than making the appointment. This is what Allah has chosen for His Prophet (s.a.w) and He does not chose for him but the best of things. Therefore, abandoning appointing a successor after his death is perfect to the rights of the Prophet (s.a.w) than making appointment. Whoever made an analogy of the obligation of appointing a successor after his death to appointing a successor while he is alive is among the most ignorant men. Abubakar do not have the knowledge that the Islamic community will appoint Umar after his death and thus, what the Prophet (s.a.w) did is suitable to him due to the grace of his knowledge and what Abubakar did is suitable to him for he does not know what the Prophet (s.a.w) knew.

Sixthly: We say: let us assume that it is obligatory for the Prophet (s.a.w) to appoint the person who will succeed him. The Prophet (s.a.w) has certainly appointed Abubakar, according to the opinion of those who are saying: He has appointed him. And he guided people to appoint Abubakar by signs, indications and suggestions, according to the other opinion.

The Rafidi stated: "... because he did not remove him from Madina." We say: This is a false statement, because when the Prophet (s.a.w) comes back, Ali is automatically removed, in similar manner that all those who he appointed during his absence are automatically removed by his return. The Prophet (s.a.w) sent him to Yemen (after he has returned from Tabuk) and it is from Yemen that he travelled to Makka in order to attend the farewell pilgrimage with the Prophet (s.a.w). Before travelling for the farewell pilgrimage, the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed somebody to succeed him in Madina. Do you envisage that the Prophet (s.a.w) is living in Madina and Ali is in Yemen and yet he is the representative of the Prophet in Madina?

Certainly, the statement of those people (Shia Rafidah) are statements of those who are ignorant of the conditions and history of the Prophet (s.a.w); as if they think that Ali continued to be the representative of the Prophet (s.a.w) in Madina up to the time he died, and they did not know that the Prophet (s.a.w) has sent Ali after that in the eighth (8th year after immigration), with Abubakar in order to nullify the covenant (between the Prophet and the polytheists) and he made Abubakar his leader. After he come back from the pilgrimage with Abubakar; the Prophet (s.a.w) sent him to Yemen, in similar manner that he sent Mua'az bin Jabal and Abu Musa al-'Ash'ariy.

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING HADITH OF LEGATEE AND SUCCESSORSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The fifth evidence: What has been narrated by the Ahlus Sunnah that the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali: ‘You are my brother, my legatee, my successor after me and the one who will repay my debts.’ This is a text on this issue.”

We reply the above claim from many perfectives:

Firstly: We request for the soundness of this hadith to be proven, for this hadith is not in the books that are reliable in such a manner that a mere ascription of a hadith to it is acceptable. Furthermore, no scholar among the scholars of hadith has verified it as sound. With regard to his assertion that: “It has been narrated by the Ahlus Sunnah.” If he mean by that scholars of hadith have narrated it in reliable books such as Bukhari and Muslim etc., and say that it is sound; then, this is a lie against them. If he mean that it has been narrated by scholars like Abu Nu’aim (in al-Fada’il), Ibn Maghazili and Khatib al-Khawarizim and scholars like them or is being narrated in the books of virtues of the Prophet’s companions; then, a mere narration in those books is not an evidence even on issues bordering on branches of religion. Therefore, how can anybody accept their hadith on issue bordering on leadership upon which you (Shia) have raised too much uproar and commotion?

Secondly: Certainly, this hadith is a lied, spurious, fabricated hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Ibn Hazm has said that: “All this types of hadith are fabricated and the sign of fabrication in them can be identified by whoever has limited knowledge of hadith, its transmission and its sciences.”^[194] He has certainly told the truth, for surely whoever has limited knowledge concerning sound hadiths and weak hadiths, will discern that this hadith and those similar to it are weak. Nay, lies and fabrications.

Thirdly: That the debt of the Prophet (s.a.w) was not liquidated by Ali (for he is not indebted by the time he died). Nay, it come in sound hadith that when the Prophet died his shield is a collateral in the

hand of a Jew, for he took a loan of thirty Awsuq (measures) of wheat that he brought to his family (Bukhari). The collateral has therefore, repaid the debt of the Prophet (s.a.w) and there isn't any known debt against the Prophet (s.a.w). In a sound hadith, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“My heirs shall not share Dinar or Dirham, whatever I left after the sustenance of my wives and payment of my workers is charity (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Therefore, if there is any debt against him it will be repaid from what he left for that is advanced first before charity as has been established by sound hadiths.

SEGMENT: NEGATING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF BROTHERHOOD PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: "The sixth evidence: Hadith of making bond of brotherhood. It was narrated by Anas that the Prophet (s.a.w) on the day of mutual imprecation (Mubahala), he made bond of brotherhood between the Muhajirun and Ansar. Ali is standing, he saw him and knew him, but he did not make him brother to anybody. Ali left weeping and the Prophet (s.a.w) asked: 'What has the father of Hasan done?' They said: 'He left weeping.' He said: O Bilal! Go and bring him to me. Bilal went to call him.

Ali entered his house weeping and Fatima asked him: 'What is making you cry?' He replied: 'The Prophet (s.a.w) established bond of brotherhood between Muhajirun and Ansar and he did not make me brother to anybody.' She said: 'Allah will not disgrace you! May be he reserved you for himself.' Bilal came to his door and said: 'O Ali answer the call of the Prophet (s.a.w).' He came to the Prophet (s.a.w), who asked him: 'What make you cry, O father of Hasan?' Ali informed him and he said: 'I only reserved you for myself, won't you be happy to be my brother?' Ali replied: 'Nay, I love it.' The Prophet took hold of his hand and walk to the pulpit and said: 'O Allah, this man is from me and I am from him, certainly he is to me as Aaron (a.s) is to Moses (a.s), certainly whoever beloved friend I am, Ali is his beloved friend.' He left and Umar followed him saying: 'Bravo, O father of Hasan, you have become my friend and the friend of every believer.' Making bond of brotherhood indicated precedence and thus, he shall be the leader."

We reply to the above claims from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration to be proven. Furthermore, he did not ascribe this narration to any book as was his custom, although ascribing it to those books is neither a proof in itself nor evidence. In this case, he just mentioned the narration as is the custom of his scholars, the scholars of Shia Rafidah; they tell lies and narrate lies without chain of authorities. Ibn Mubarak said:

“Chain of authority is part of religion, if not due to chain of authority anybody can say what he like to say. If (a liar) he is asked (concerning chain of authority) he will stop flabbergasted.”

Secondly: This hadith is fabricated according to the verdict of scholars of hadith. Nobody among the scholars of hadith doubt that it is fabricated and that the person who fabricated it is an ignorant man. He told clear, open, detectable lie, that is known as a lie by whoever has limited knowledge of hadith as will be explained.

Thirdly: Certainly, all the hadiths that has been mentioned concerning making bond of friendship with Ali are fabricated lies. Furthermore, the Prophet (s.a.w) did not take anybody as brother and he did not establish bond of brotherhood between a Muhajir and a Muhajir, neither did he establish bond of brotherhood between Abubakar and Umar, nor between an Ansar and an Ansar. But he established bond of brotherhood between Muhajirun and Ansar in the first period of his arrival in Madina. And mutual imprecation took place when the delegation of Najran (Christians) come to the Prophet (s.a.w) in the ninth or tenth year after the immigration to Madina.

Fourthly: The signs of lies are very clear in this hadith among which are: “On the day of mutual imprecation (Mubahala) he made bond of brotherhood between the Muhajirun and Ansar.” Mutual imprecation took place when the delegation of Christians come to Madina from Najran in order to meet the Prophet (s.a.w) and that was the time when Allah revealed Chapter Three (Ali Imran) of the Qur’an and that was at the last period in the 9th or 10th year after immigration to Madina.

Fifthly: Establishment of bond of friendship between the Muhajirun and Ansar took place in the first year of immigration to Madina and it took place in the house of Banu Najjar. There are many years apart between establishment of bond of brotherhood and the episode of mutual imprecation.

Sixthly: The Prophet (s.a.w) established bond of brotherhood between the Muhajirun and Ansar. The prophet (s.a.w) and Ali are all from the Muhajirun and there isn’t any established bond of

brotherhood between them. Nay the Prophet (s.a.w) established bond of brotherhood between Ali and Sahal bin Hanif.

Seventhly: His words: ***“Are you not satisfied to be unto me as Aaron (a.s) is to Moses (a.s)?”*** The Prophet (s.a.w) made this statement during the battle of Tabuk, just once and he never repeated that statement in any other sitting (or situation) by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF KHAIBAR PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The seventh evidence: What has been narrated by all the Ahlus Sunnah that after the Prophet (s.a.w) has laid siege against Khaibar for twenty one nights; the flag was in the hand of Ali but he was afflicted by eye sickness and it became inflamed. Marhab the leader of the Jews announced the beginning of war. The Prophet (s.a.w) invited Abubakar and asked him: ‘Take the flag.’ He took the flag in the company of a number of Muhajirun and he tried and was not successful and returned defeated. The next day the flag was given to Umar, but he too was not successful and he comes back. He said: ‘Bring to me Ali!’ It was said to him: ‘He is suffering from eye sickness.’ He said: ‘Bring him to me! Show me the man who is loved by Allah and His Prophet and he love Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w). Who do not flee from the battlefield.’ They brought Ali and the Prophet (s.a.w) spit on his hands and rubbed them on the eyes of Ali, and he became healed instantly. The Prophet (s.a.w) gave him the flag and Allah gave victory at his hands. He killed Marhab (leader of the Jews). His being described with those descriptions by the Prophet (s.a.w) showed that other people among the companions do not possess them.”

The answers to the above contentions are from many perspectives: Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this hadith to be proven. With regard to his statement that: “It was narrated by all Ahlus Sunnah scholars.” Certainly, the reliable men (among them) that narrated this hadith did not narrate it in this manner. What come in sound hadith is that Ali is absent from Khaibar and he is not in Khaibar. He stayed back from the battle because his eyes are sick, but he felt distressed for staying back from the Prophet (s.a.w) and thus, he went in order to join him. The prophet (s.a.w) said before he arrive: “Certainly, I will give the flag to a man who love Allah and His Messenger and Allah and His messenger love him and Allah will give victory through him. A version of the hadith runs as follows: **“Suhail**

reported on the authority of Abu Huraira that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said on the Day of Khaibar: I shall certainly give this standard in the hand of one who loves Allah and his Messenger and Allah will grant victory at his hand. Umar b. Khattab said: Never did I cherish for leadership but on that day. I came before him with the hope that I may be called for this, but Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) called 'Ali b. Abu Talib and he conferred (this honour) upon him and said: Proceed on and do not look about until Allah grants you victory, and 'Ali went a bit and then halted and did not look about and then said in a loud voice: Allah's Messenger, on what issue should I fight with the people? Thereupon he (the Prophet) said: Fight with them until they bear testimony to the fact that there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his Messenger, and when they do that then their blood and their riches are inviolable from your hands but what is justified by law and their reckoning is with Allah" (Muslim).

In another sound hadith it was reported as follows: "Salama bin Akwa' reported that it was 'Ali whom Allah's Apostle (s.a.w) left behind him on the occasion of the campaign of Khaibar, and his eyes were inflamed and he said: Is it for me to remain behind Allah's Messenger (s.a.w)! So he went forth and rejoined Allah's Apostle (s.a.w) and on the evening of that night (after which) next morning Allah granted victory. Allah's Messenger (s.a.w) said: I will certainly give this standard to a man whom Allah and His Messenger love. or he said: Who loves Allah or His Messenger and Allah will grant him victory through him, and, lo, we saw 'Ali whom we least expected (to be present on that occasion). They (the Companions) said: Here is 'Ali. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (s.a.w) gave him the standard. Allah granted victory at his hand" (Muslim).

Therefore, the flag has not been given to Abubakar or Umar before that time and none of them has gone to the war front. All those claims are lies and that is why Umar said: ***"Never did I cherish for leadership but on that day."*** All the companions went to bed that

night wishing to be appointed and be given the flag to lead the army. In the morning, he called Ali. It was said to him he is suffering from eye sickness. When he come, the Prophet (s.a.w) spit on his eyes and he became well, thereafter, he gave him the flag.

This specific mention of Ali is a recompense for his coming to the war front although he is sick. The Prophet (s.a.w) informed his companions about the coming of Ali before he arrived, is among his miracles. Absolutely, there is nothing in the hadith that lower down the status of Abubakar and Umar.

Secondly: The information given by the Prophet (s.a.w) that Ali loves Allah and His messenger (s.a.w) and that Allah and His messenger (s.a.w) loves Ali is a reply to the Nawasib. But the Shia Rafidah who are saying that the Prophet's companions have apostate after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w), cannot be able to take this hadith as an evidence and prove with it their claims because the Kharijites are saying: "Ali is among those who have apostate," in the same manner that they said after the verdict of the two arbitrators: "Certainly, you have apostate from Islam, so return to it."

The Rafidi stated: "His being described with these characteristics showed that the other companions do not possess them." We have two replies to this claim:

1. If that is accepted, he said: "I will give the flag to a man who loves Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) and Allah and His messenger (s.a.w) loves him and Allah will give victory through him. This trait is specifically his own for the victory was given through him. The fact is that Allah has given this particular victory through him does not entailed that he is better than others and it absolutely did not make leadership exclusively his right after the Prophet (s.a.w).

We do not accept that the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) entailed exclusiveness to Ali or debarment of others from those traits. In similar manner if someone say: I will certainly give this money to a poor man, or a righteous man, or I will certainly visit a righteous, sick man today or I will give this flag to a brave man etc., there is nothing in these expressions which entailed that those characteristics can

only be found in one man, but it showed that that individual possess those traits.

Thirdly: If we assume that he is the best at that moment, it does not mean that another person is not better than him after that period.

Fourthly: If we assume that he is the best, that does not mean that he is an infallible leader who has been appointed by Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w) to be the leader after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Certainly, many among the Shia Zaidiyyah, the later Mu'atazilites and some other groups believe that he is the best, but the leader is Abubakar and their opinion is that leadership of the inferior (over the superior) is right and accepted.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF BIRD PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The eighth evidence: All the Ahlus Sunnah have narrated that: Anas ibn Malik narrated, he said, ‘I used to serve the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) was served a roasted bird. Then he (s.a.w) said, ‘Oh Allah, bring to me the one whom You love the most among all your creatures to eat with me this bird.’ Then I said, ‘Oh Allah, let him be a man from Ansar (the supporters).’ Then Ali come and sought for permission to enter, then I (Anas) said, ‘The Messenger of Allah is busy (with something).’ Then (he came) again and I said, ‘The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is busy.’ Then he came (third time) and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said, ‘Open! (to let him in).’ Then he (Ali) went in. Then the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said, ‘What was holding you from coming to me?’ Then he (Ali) replied, ‘This is the third time Anas held me back, claiming that you are busy doing something?’ Then he (s.a.w) said, ‘What made you do what you did?’ Then I (Anas) said, ‘O Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)! I had heard your supplication and I liked it to be one of my folk.’ Then the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said, ‘The man might love his folk (his own tribe).’ The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘O Anas! Is there anybody among the Ansar who is better than Ali?’ Since he is the best creatures of Allah to Him, it is obligatory that he become the leader.”

The answer the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: With regard to his statement: All Ahlus Sunnah have narrated it.” This is a lie against Ahlus Sunnah, because nobody among the authors of reliable books of hadith has narrated it and nobody among the scholars of hadith has declared it sound. It is a hadith that has been narrated by some people, in the same manner that they narrated similar hadiths on the virtues of Ali. Nay, many hadiths have been narrated on the virtues of Mu’awiyah and books have been written on that, but scholars of hadith are not accepting this or that (without verification).

Secondly: The hadith of the bird is among the spurious, fabricated lies in accordance to the evaluation of scholars of hadith. Abu Musa al-Madani said: “Many scholars of hadith have compiled all the chains of the hadith of the bird for consideration and knowledge. Among those scholars are Hakim Nisaburi, Abu Nu’aim, and Ibn Marduweih. Hakim was asked concerning the hadith of the bird and he replied: ‘This is not sound.’ He gave this verdict although he is ascribed to belonging to Shia sect.”^[195]

Thirdly: Eating a roasted bird is not a great act that suited waiting for the most beloved creatures of Allah to come and eat it with the Prophet of Allah (s.a.w). Certainly, eating food is decreed for the righteous and the profligates. Consuming food (roasted bird with the Prophet) is not an act that brings one near to Allah, it is not an aid to the religion, and it does not bring any religious or worldly benefit. Therefore, what is the great outstanding act in eating that suited coming of the most beloved of Allah’s creatures to come and do it?

Fourthly: This hadith has contradicted the beliefs of Shia Rafidah because they are saying: The Prophet (s.a.w) knew the most beloved creatures of Allah and that he has already appointed him to be his successor after him. In contrast, this hadith is showing that he does not know the person who is the most beloved to Allah.

Fifthly: We say: either the Prophet (s.a.w) knew the person who is the most beloved to Allah or he does not know. If he knew him, he can easily send someone to call him, in the like manner that he used to call anybody he wishes among his companions, or he can pray saying: O Allah! Make Ali come to me for he is the most beloved of Your creatures. What is the need for ambiguity and supplicating for his coming? If he has named Ali, he would have saved Anas from his false aspiration and he will not close the door before him.

Sixthly: Certainly, the sound hadiths in sound reliable books of hadith that have been agreed upon and accepted by all scholars has contradicted this hadith. Then why advance this false, fabricated, hadith that has not been judged as sound by scholars.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF CALLING ALI COMMANDER OF BELIEVERS PROVE HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The ninth evidence: What has been narrated by all Ahlus Sunnah, that the Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded his companions to be saluting Ali with the title of the commander of the believers. He said: ‘He is the master of the Muslims, leader of the pious and the chief of the singularly radiants.’^[196] And he said: ‘This is the friend of every believer after me.’ He said concerning Ali: ‘He is from me and I am from him and he is closer to the believers; men and women than their own selves.’ For these reasons Ali alone shall be the leader and these are texts (proving) on that issue.”

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for its chain of authority and an explanation to its soundness. He did not ascribe it to any book, as was his custom. With regard to his statement that: “All Ahlus Sunnah have narrated it.” We say: This is a lie because this is not in the known books of hadiths; it is no in the Sihah, or Masanid, or Sunan etc., so if it has been narrated by some haphazard compilers of hadiths, who have narrated similar garbage; then, this type is not a proof that must be followed, by the consensus of Muslims.

Allah the Most High has forbidden us from telling lies and speaking about Him on what we have no knowledge. Concurrent hadiths have been related from the Prophet (s.a.w), where he said: **“Telling lies about me is not like telling lies about anyone else. Whoever tells lies about me deliberately, let him take his place in Hell” (Bukhari).** It was also narrated by Muslim in the Introduction to his Sahih, without the phrase **“Telling lies about me is not like telling lies about anyone else.”** And the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **“Do not tell lies about me, for whoever tells lies about me will enter Hell” (Bukhari).** And he (s.a.w) said: **“Whoever narrates a hadith from me that he thinks is false is one of the liars” (Muslim).**

Secondly: This hadith is a fabricated spurious hadith by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Whoever has limited knowledge of hadith knows that it is a lied fabricated hadith. Nobody among the scholars of hadith narrated it in a reliable book, neither in sound books of hadith, nor in Sunan or Masanid that are acceptable.

Thirdly: It is forbidden to ascribe this type of hadith to the Messenger of Allah, for whoever said it is a liar, and the Prophet (s.a.w) is free, absolved and protected from lying and this is because: We do not know anybody who is; "the Master of the believers, chief of those who fear Allah and the commander of the singularly radiants," other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), by the consensus of all Muslims.

If it is claimed: Ali is their chief after him! We will reply that: There is nothing in the context of the hadith or its expression which shows or support this interpretation. Nay, it has contradicted this; because the best righteous Muslims, those who are singularly radiants are the first century of Islam and they do not have during the lifetime of the Prophet (s.a.w), any chief or leader or commander other than him. How can he inform about what he did not attend and abandon the information that he needed the most, while administering their present affairs? And according to Shia all the Muslims are either unbelievers or profligates. Therefore, who is he going to lead? Furthermore, the leader in the Day of Resurrection is the Prophet (s.a.w). Then, who will lead Ali? And according to the Shia all the Muslims are either unbelievers or profligates. Therefore, who is he going to lead? The claim that Ali is the chief of the Muslims, their leader and commander after the Prophet (s.a.w) is known to be a lie and that the Prophet never says anything concerning that. Nay, he used to clearly give preference to Abubakar and Umar over him and this fact is known to both the special and the generality to the extent that even unbelievers knew it.

With regard to the statement of the Rafidi that the Prophet said: "He (Ali) is the beloved friend of every believer after me." We reply that: This is a lie, for the Prophet (s.a.w) is the beloved friend of every believer both during his lifetime and after his death and he love every

believer in life and death. Therefore, love and support which is the opposite of hatred and enmity is not confined to a period.

With regard to the Prophet's statement to Ali: "You are from me and I am from you." This section of the hadith is sound as it was backed by another sound hadith. It shall be noted that the Prophet (s.a.w) has said to the Ash'ariyun (Ash'arites are Muslims from Yemen who immigrated to Madina): ***"They are from me and I am from them"*** (***Bukhari, Muslim***). The Prophet (s.a.w) also used the same sentence for Julaibib (r.a) as is seen in the following hadith: ***"He is mine and I am his"***(***Muslim***). Therefore, it is known that this expression does not indicate leadership or deserving to be a leader and it does not indicate that the person to who it is so addressed is the best among the companions.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE HADITH OF THE TWO WEIGHTY THINGS AND ARK OF NOAH PROVE LEADERSHIP OF ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The tenth evidence: What Ahlus Sunnah narrated that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘I am leaving among you two weighty things, the book of Allah and my progeny, people of my household, they will never separate until they meet me at the cistern.’ He also said: ‘My family among you are like the ark of Noah (a.s), whoever enter into it will escape and whoever stay back from it will be drowned.’ This showed that holding to the teachings of members of the Prophet’s household is obligatory and Ali is their master, therefore, obeying him is obligatory upon all people; thus, he is the leader.”

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: The expression of the hadith in Sahih Muslim from Zaid bin Arqam who said: ***“One day Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) stood up to deliver sermon at a watering place known as Khumm situated between Mecca and Medina. He praised Allah, extolled Him and delivered the sermon and exhorted (us) and said: Now to our purpose. O people, I am a human being. I am about to receive a messenger (the angel of death) from my Lord and I, in response to Allah's call, (would bid good-bye to you), but I am leaving among you two weighty things: the one being the Book of Allah in which there is right guidance and light, so hold fast to the Book of Allah and adhere to it. He exhorted (us) (to hold fast) to the Book of Allah and then said: The second are the members of my household I remind you (of your duties) to the members of my family. He (Husain) said to Zaid: Who are the members of his household? Aren't his wives the members of his family? Thereupon he said: His wives are the members of his family (but here) the members of his family are those for whom acceptance of Zakat is forbidden. And he said: Who are they? Thereupon he said: 'Ali***

and the offspring of 'Ali, 'Aqil and the offspring of 'Aqil and the offspring of Ja'far and the offspring of 'Abbas. Husain said: These are those for whom the acceptance of Zakat is forbidden. Zaid said: Yes" (Muslim). This hadith showed that what we are commanded to take hold of and that if we take hold of it we will not go astray is the Book of Allah. This is how it comes in another sound hadith, during the farewell pilgrimage when the Prophet (s.a.w) gave sermon, he says: ***"...I have left among you the Book of Allah, and if you hold fast to it, you would never go astray. And you would be asked about me (on the Day of Resurrection), (now tell me) what would you say? They (the audience) said: We will bear witness that you have conveyed (the message), discharged (the ministry of Prophethood) and given wise (sincere) counsel. He (the narrator) said: He (the Holy Prophet) then raised his forefinger towards the sky and pointing it at the people (said):" O Allah, be witness. O Allah, be witness," saying it thrice. (Bilal then) pronounced Adhan and later on Iqama and he (the Holy Prophet) led the noon prayer. He (Bilal) then uttered Iqama and he (the Holy Prophet) led the afternoon prayer and he observed no other prayer in between the two..." (Muslim).***

With regard to his words: "My progeny, members of my household and they will not separate until they meet me in the cistern" (Tirmidhi). This hadith was narrated by Tirmidhi. Ahmad bin Hanbal was asked concerning it and he said: It is weak, it is also declared weak by other scholars of hadith, and some of them said: "It is not sound." Some people defended this hadith saying that it means that all his progeny and household members cannot agree on straying from the right path. They say, this is our opinion, as mentioned by Qadi Abu Ya'ali and some scholars.

The progeny of the Prophet (s.a.w) and members of his household do not agree on any principle of the principles and creeds of Shia Rafidah – all thanks be to Allah – nay, they are absolved from darkening themselves from all their principles and beliefs.

With regard to his words: "Members of my household are the like the ark of Noah (a.s)..." We do not know any sound chain of authority for

this hadith and it is not in any reliable book of hadith. If some people have narrated it like those who record hadith haphazardly and narrates fabricated hadiths; then this only increase its weakness.

Secondly: The Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning his household members and his progeny that they will not separate until they meet him at the cistern and he is the truthful whose words are the truth. This showed that the consensus of his progeny is a proof. This is the opinion of some of our companions. It was mentioned by al-Qadi in his book “al-Mu’atamad.” But the progeny and members of his household are all the Banu Hashim: Children of Abbas, children of Ali, children of Harith bin Abdulmutallib and all the Banu Abi Talib etc., and Ali alone is not the Prophet’s household and the master of the Prophet’s household is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).^[197]

Thirdly: The Prophet’s household do not have consensus on either his leadership or his precedence. The scholars of the Prophet’s household such as Abdullah bin Abbas etc., are putting forward Abubakar and Umar on the issues of leadership and precedence.

Fourthly: This has been contradicted by greater and stronger proof, which is the consensus of the Islamic community on the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His messenger (s.a.w) and consensus of the Muslim community. And the Prophet’s household are part of the Islamic community and therefore, the consensus of the Islamic community encompasses the consensus of the Prophet’s household and the best of the Islamic community is Abubakar as has been explained and will be explained further (in later discourses).

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT FABRICATED HADITH ON LOVE OF ALI PROVE HIS LEADERSHI

The Rafidi stated: “The eleventh evidence: What has been narrated by Ahlus Sunnah about the obligation of loving him (Ali) and befriending him. Ahmad bin Hanbal narrated in his Musnad that the Prophet (s.a.w) took hold of the hands of Hasan and Husain and said: ‘Whoever love me and love those two, their father and mother, he is with me in my graden in the Hereafter.’ Ibn Khalawaihi narrated from Huzaifa, who said: The Prophet says: ‘Whoever want to take hold of the staff of Ruby, which Allah created with His Hand and He said to it: Exist and it became, he shall love Ali after me.’ From Abu Sa’id al-Khudri who said: The Prophet (s.a.w) said to Ali; ‘loving you is belief and hating you is hypocrisy and the first person to enter Paradise is the person who love you and the first person to enter Hell-Fire is the person who hates you. Allah has made you to deserve that honor, you are from me and I am from you and there is no Prophet after me.’ From Shaiq bin Salma, from Abdullah who said: ‘I saw the Prophet (s.a.w) taking hold of the hand of Ali and saying; this is my friend and I am his friend, I am an enemy to whoever he takes as an enemy and I am at peace with whoever he makes peace.’ Akhtab al-Khawarizim narrated from Jabir, he says; the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘Angel Gabriel come to me with green paper and the writing on it is in white. It was written in it: I have certainly made the love of Ali obligatory upon My creatures, therefore, convey to them this message from Me.’ There are a lot of innumerable hadiths on this issue in the sources of the opposition (Ahlus Sunnah). It showed that he is the best among them and that he deserved to be the leader.

Answer to the above claims is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of the narrated hadiths to be proven and they will never be able to establish their soundness. Concerning his (the Rafidi) statement: “it was narrated by Ahmad.”

We reply that: Firstly, Ahmad has a well known book of hadith (the Musnad) and he also has a well known book titled, Fada'il as-Sahabah in which he recorded hadiths that cannot be recorded in the Musnad, because it is weak (or fabricated) and thus, it is not suitable to be recorded in it. Most of those hadiths are Mursal^[198] or weak without Irsal (without being Mursal). Furthermore, his son has made many additions in the book and thereafter al-Qutai'i, who transmitted the book from his son Abdullah, also made many additions that he received from his teachers and there are a lot of fabricated hadiths in those additions by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

This Rafidi and those similar to him among the scholars of Shia Rafidah are ignorant men, for they are copying and quoting from that book thinking that whatever has been added by al-Qutai'i and his son Abdullah (the son of Ahmad) are narrated by Ahmad himself. And they are not able to differentiate between the teachers of Ahmad and the teachers (and sources) of al-Qutai'i. The first hadith mentioned by the Rafidi is among the additions of al-Qutai'i. He narrated it from Nasr bin Ali, from Ali bin Ja'afar, from his brother Musa bin Ja'afar. The second hadith was recorded by Ibn Jawzi in his book on fabricated hadiths (al-Mawdu'at), and he explained that it is fabricated. The mere narration of Ibn Khalaweihi does not mean that it is sound, by the consensus of the scholars of hadith. The same thing can be said about the narrations of Khatib Khawarizim for there are a lot of lies in his narrations that are identified as the most horrible fabrications, by the consensus of scholars of hadith.

Secondly: These hadiths that have been narrated by Ibn Khalaweihi are fabricated lies according to the evaluation of scholars of hadith. The same verdict is given about his statement: "The first person to enter Hell-Fire is the person who hates you." Can a Muslim say that the Kharijites will enter Hell-Fire before Abu Jahal bin Hisham or Pharaoh or Abu Lahb and men similar to them among the polytheists? The same thing can be said about his statement: "The first person to enter Paradise is the one who love you." Can any rational person, who is sane say: The reason why Prophet and

Messengers of Allah are the first people to enter Paradise is because of their love for Ali and not love of Allah and His messenger and all the Prophets and His Messengers? Can it be rational that the love of Allah and his Messenger is not the reason for entering Paradise by those who enter first?

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING ARGUMENT OF THE RAFIDI THAT WHOEVER DIFFERRED WITH ALI HAS APOSTATE FROM ISLAM

The Rafidi stated: “The twelfth evidence: Akhtab Khawarizim narrated with its chain of authority to Abu Dhar, who said: ‘The Prophet (s.a.w) says; whoever opposes Ali’s Caliphate is an unbeliever, for he has fought Allah and His Messenger and whoever doubt Ali is an unbeliever.’ Anas said: ‘I was with the Messenger of Allah and he saw Ali coming and said: Myself and this man are the proofs of Allah upon my community in the Hereafter.’ Mu’awiyah bin Haidah al-Qushairi said: ‘I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying: Whoever died hating Ali has died as a Christian or a Jew.’”

Answer to the above claims is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We are requesting for the soundness of the narration to be proven. This is only a way of softening the heat of debate; otherwise, a mere narration of Khatib Khawarizim does not prove the soundness of a hadith from the Prophet (s.a.w) even if one does not know what has been recorded of lies, spurious and fabricated hadiths (in his book). Whoever assess and evaluate what this man has gathered and recorded will have no alternative than to exclaim, “Glory be to You (O Allah) this is a great lie!”

Secondly: Whoever has knowledge of the science of hadith will give testimony that these hadiths are fabricated lies against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

Thirdly: if these hadiths are among what has been narrated by the companions and the Tabi’un; where is there mention among them? Who narrated these hadiths from them? Which book stated that they have narrated them? Whoever knew what has happened between the companions, knew out of necessity that these hadiths are lies fabricated by liars after them.

Fourthly: We knew that the Muhajirun and Ansar are Muslims who love Allah and His messenger (s.a.w) and the Prophet (s.a.w) used

to love them and befriend them and that Abubakar was the leader after the Prophet (s.a.w), in a greater measure to our knowledge of (assumed) soundness of these hadiths. Therefore, how can we reject what we knew through concurrent, sure knowledge with narrations that are lower than lone hadiths (Akhbar al-Ahad) and narrations with regard to which no single reliable narrator is known to have narrated them? Nay, scholars of hadith have had consensus that these are the greatest fabricated hadiths against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). This is why none of it can be found in any reliable book of hadith. Nay, all scholars of hadith are certain that they are fabricated lies.

Fifthly: The Noble Qur'an gave testimony in many places to the fact that Allah is pleased with them and He praises them, such as: **“And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun (those who migrated from Makka to Al-Madina) and the Ansar (the citizens of Al-Madina who helped and gave aid to the Muhajirun) and also those who followed them exactly (in Faith). Allah is well-pleased with them as they are well-pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow (Paradise), to dwell therein forever. That is the supreme success” (9:100).**

Sixthly: These hadiths are censuring and disparaging Ali and stating that he is denier of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w).^[199] The soundness of these hadiths entailed that all the Prophet's companions (Ali inclusive) are unbelievers. These lied fabricated hadiths entailed that those who appointed other than Ali as Caliph are unbelievers and Ali did not act upon those texts because he considered them to be Muslims. The worst people that fought Ali are the Kharijites and yet he (Ali) did not call them unbelievers, instead of that he forbids taking their wealth as war booty and taking their women and children as war captives and he used to say to them before fighting them: Your rights upon us are that we do not prevent you from coming to our mosques and we will not deny you your rights to government grants. When Ibn Muljam stabbed him, he said: “If I survive, I am the guardian of my blood.” And he did not say that he shall be killed because he is an apostate. It was also narrated

concurrently from him that he forbids going after those who fled from the battlefield in the battles of Camel and Siffin. He also prohibited killing their wounded, taking them as captives, taking their wealth as war booty and taking their women and children as slaves. Therefore, if those people are unbelievers, as provided by the (fabricated) texts, then Ali is the first person to disbelieve in those texts and to reject them and that will entail that he is an unbeliever.

Furthermore, Ali used to offer prayer of the dead on those who are killed in the battle of Siffin from the side of the Syrians and he used to say: "They are our brothers who transgressed against us, the sword has cleansed them." If they are unbelievers in his estimation, he would not have prayed over their dead bodies, he will not have called them "our brother," and he will not have considered the sword as a cleansing for them from their sins.

Our aim here is not to excommunicate people from Islam, but to make people note that these hadiths are known out of necessity to be fabricated lies against the Prophet (s.a.w). That they have contradicted the religion of Islam; that it entailed ascribing Ali to apostasy and likewise those who differed with him; and that nobody who believe in Allah and the Last Day will make such a statement let alone being the words of the Prophet (s.a.w)! Nay, ascribing them to the Prophet (s.a.w) – we seek Allah's refuge – is the greatest censure and disparagement against him. We have no doubt that these are the fabrications of atheists, Zindiqs with the intention of destroying the religion of Islam. May Allah curse whoever fabricated them and what the Prophet (s.a.w) promised him suffices him when he said: ***"Telling lies about me is not like telling lies about anyone else. Whoever tells lies about me deliberately let him take his place in Hell" (Bukhari).***

*** The Rafidi stated: "We have transmitted multiple (that which is several times as much) hadiths from our reliable men."

We reply that: We Ahlus Sunnah are criticizing our scholars of the science of hadith comprehensively and painstakingly. We have written many books on authenticating and disparaging them,

explaining in it their truthfulness and their weaknesses, their mistakes, their lies, and their delusion. Absolutely, we do not favor anybody – even if he is virtuous – and thus, we reject the hadith of anyone among them due to making many mistakes (in transmission) or poor memorization, even if he is among the friends of Allah. In contrast to Shia Rafidah, for reliability to them is that the transmitter of a hadith shall be a member of their sect; it does not matter if he made mistake, he has memorized, he lied, or he tell the truth. The utmost that can be said is that your men are similar to our men and they possess such and such conduct. It is necessarily known that there are liars among the Ahlus Sunnah and in all considerations and conditions, you (Shia Rafidah) are the greatest liars. Therefore, it is forbidden upon us to accept a hadith until we study its chain of authority (and text). Then, how can you authenticate a person that you do not know, you did not know his name (or evaluate him), and he is not mentioned among the reliable men? What you generally possessed are books and narrations that have been narrated by liars or you do not know its soundness, in the same manner that the Jews and Christians do not know the soundness of their books. The lies of Shia Rafidah are among the things that have been coined into maxims. We knew that the Kharijites are evil people, but we cannot be able to call them liars, because we have tested them and found that they are among those who are truthful; they have things against them and they have other things in their favor, in contrast to Shia Rafidah, for finding a truthful person among them is an abnormality. Ibn Mubarak stated: “Religion is with the scholars of hadith, statements, ruse and tricks are with people of opinion and lies are with Shia Rafidah.” Ahlus Sunnah and hadith do not accept lies even if it agrees with their opinions. There are many hadiths that have been recorded on the virtues of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman and nay, on the virtues of Mu’awiyah. They have been recorded with chains of authorities by men such as Naqqash, Abu Nu’aim, Khatib, and Ibn Asakir, and they are more than those reported on the virtues of Ali, but scholars of hadith and its sciences do not accept any of it and they ascribed it to lying and fabrication. Nay, if there is one unknown reporter in a hadith, they will reject it.

The main condition of accepting a hadith by Shia Rafidah is that it agrees with their opinion, whether it is false or sound and whenever they prove their creed with a sound hadith, it will not agree with their opinion and it will not support their creed.

We (Ahlus Sunnah) rely on the texts of the Qur'an, what has been established of sound hadiths, and what has been agreed upon by Muslims other than you. Whatever comes to us contrary to these, we reject it. Abu Faraj bin Jawzi stated that: "The sound virtues of Ali are many, but Shia Rafidah are not satisfied with them and thus, they fabricated for him what lowers his status instead of lifting him up; Allah has protected him from requiring falsehood."

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING DISBELIEF ON THOSE WHO OPPOSED THE CALIPHATE OF ALI

*** The motives of the Prophet's companions after his death are absolutely directed towards following the truth. There is nothing that can push them away from the truth as per as their abilities. When the exigencies of following the truth are established, and what can push them away from the truth is nil by the ability to withstand it, it is compulsory to stand by it. Our knowledge that the Prophet's companions (r.a) are the best generation entailed that they have followed the truth in what they have done, because they are the best community (raised for mankind – see Q3:V110); Allah has perfected their religion and completed His favor upon them (see Q5:V3). They gave vow of allegiance to Abubakar as an act of worship and not because they desire from him any worldly recompense or because they fear him. If they act upon the exigencies of (Arab) customs and traditions and natural disposition, they will forward Ali or Abbas due to the noble status of Banu Hashim (among Arabs) over Banu Taym (the clan of Abubakar). When his father was informed – at that time he is a very old man in Makka – that his son has succeeded the Prophet (s.a.w), he asked: “Did Banu Umayyah, Banu Hashim and Banu Makhzum accepted that?” They replied him saying: “Yes!” He was surprised and said: “That is the Grace of Allah, He bestow it upon whomever He Will!” This is because he knew that Banu Taym is the weakest Arab clan, but Islam give preference over fear of Allah and not blood relation.

Furthermore, it was concurrently and successively reported that the Prophet (s.a.w) said that the best generation is his generation. In one of those sound hadiths, ***“Aisha reported that a person asked Allah's Apostle (s.a.w) as to who amongst the people were the best. He said: ‘Of the generation to which I belong, then of the second generation (generation adjacent to my generation), then of the third generation (generation adjacent to the second generation)’” (Muslim).*** Therefore, the first generation of this community is the best by the consensus of scholars. Whoever

compares the condition of the first generation of Muslims to that of the second generation will understand the differences between them. Therefore, if the first generation – as asserted by Shia Rafidah - of Muslims denied the rights of the textually appointed leader; refused the family of its Prophet (s.a.w) its inheritance, gave vow of allegiance to a profligate oppressor, and denied same to a just scholar out of arrogance and denial of the truth! These will entailed that, those people are the worse of created beings and this community is the worse community raised for mankind!

Furthermore, it is known through successive, concurrent hadiths that the Prophet (s.a.w) has taken Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman as his very close companions; he meet with them, accompany them and they are his in-laws. It is never known that he used to disparage them or hate them. Nay, he used to commend them, praise them and love them. Therefore, he either knew that they are on the right path both outwardly and inwardly, in the first place. And this is what is required. Secondly; he either knew that he is just compromising with them or he does not know (their conditions). Any of the two options that is assumed is a great disparagement of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). And if they have derailed after being on the straight path, it entailed that Allah has abandon His Messenger (s.a.w) concerning his most intimate companions. Where is the knowledge of the one who foretold what is going to happen concerning this? Where is the necessary precautions taken so that the Islamic community will not appoint those people to position of authority? How can the closest grand companions of the person who was promised that his religion will be aided over all religions became apostates (see Q9V33, 48:28, and 61:9)? This is the greatest censure against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and faulting him, so that the Batinite and the Zindiq (atheists and heretics) will say: “He is a bad man, who has bad companions! If he is good man, his companions will be like him.” This is why scholars say that: Certainly, the creed of Shia Rafida is the conspiracy of Zanadaqah (heretics).

Furthermore, that the motives that will obligate the Caliphate – if he really deserved it more than anyone else – are very strong, what will

push it away from him is nil and ability (to establish it) exist. With the availability of motives, ability and the none existence of any hindrance, the act is obligated. This is because Ali is the cousin of the Prophet (s.a.w), the noble in kindred relation, he is among the first to embrace Islam, he is in-law and he has fought for the sake of establishing Islam. These in addition to the fact that they do not hold any enmity against him and he never kill anybody from among the Banu Taym and Banu Ady. Nay, he killed from Banu Abdulmunaf; but they love him and prefer him, because he is closer to them regarding kindred relation. Abu Sufyan talked to him concerning that (the Caliphate). Therefore, if the prophet (s.a.w) has appointed him as his successor after him – or he is the best and the most deserved – that will have motivated them to appoint him as the Caliph, under these conditions. If it occurs that some few people are trying to take it away from him; it is well known that most of them do not possess the ability to prevent him from becoming the Caliph. Nay, (his supporters) will be able to make him the Caliph. If the Ansar have said: Ali deserved to be the Caliph than Sa'ad bin Ubadah and Abubakar, those few men of the Muhajirun present cannot be able to defend themselves and most of the people will team up with Ali. Nay, many people among the companions do not want Umar to be their Caliph because he is stern towards them. Therefore, the analogy is that they will not give him their vow of allegiance. After that (objection) when Abubakar selected him, they all obeyed him. It is well that Talha said to Abubakar: "O successor of the Prophet, you knew full well how harsh Umar has been towards us all during your regime, and only Allah knows what he will meet to us when you are gone. You know that you are leaving us forever, and yet you are content to leave us in the hands of a man whose fierce and ungovernable rages are well known to you. Think O Chief, what answer will you give to Your Lord for such a behest?" At this objection of Talha, Abubakar who was lying prostrate on his bed, he rose up with considerable effort and addressing Talha said: "Have you come to frighten me? I swear that when I meet my Lord, I will gladly tell Him that I appointed as ruler over His people, the man who was the best of them all." If we assumed that most of the Muslims

stood by Ali; who will overcome him? Let us assume that they refused to rise up and they were not defeated; are the motives of this type of issue not obligating rising up or at least some arguments will take place? Is this not better to be spoken about than appointment of Sa'ad bin Ubadah? If the Ansar – due to some ambiguities – desired Sa'ad bin Ubadah to be the Caliph, then the person who has right and possess texts of appointment from the Prophet (s.a.w): Why is it that his aids and supporters do not possess more desire to make him the Caliph? If nobody speak and nobody make claim to the Caliphate of Ali – neither he, by himself, nor any other person – and the affair continued to move as it is until the turn come to him! Thereafter, he and his supporters rose up and fought (in order to unify the Caliphate under him) and he never remain silent, to the extent that what has happened has happened; it is known out of necessity that his silence at the beginning of the affair is not due to the existence of obstacle or impediments. Abubakar is the farthest person from constituting an obstacle against the Caliphate of Ali, if he has textual right to the Caliphate. If Abubakar rise – and he is unfair – to prevent Ali, who is right, both the law and intellect will entail that people will support the person who is right, the appointed infallible against Abubakar, the unjust oppressor – if the matter is as stated. Therefore, follow the scientific method of evaluation and assessment and abandon obstacles on the road.

Certainly, there are many types of sophism. Firstly, negating, denying and refusing to accept either what exist or the knowledge about it. Secondly, doubting, suspicion and saying: “We do not know.” This is the method of the skeptics; they do not deny and they do not affirm; and in reality they have negated what is known (as a fact). Thirdly, those who say that realities are in accordance to beliefs. They say: Whoever believes that the world is uncreated, he is also uncreated, and whoever believe that the world is created he is also created. If the matter is as explained; then disparaging what is known as the condition of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the rightly guided Caliphs, concerning their history and conduct with what is being narrated by Shia Rafidah in which they ascribed the generality of the Islamic

community to lying is the greatest sophism. Likewise, whoever narrates narrations on the virtues of Mu'awiyyah and his companions, with what he gave him precedence over Ali and his sincere companions is a sophist, liar.

SEGMENT: MENTIONING THE STATUS OF RFIDAH WITH REGARD TO HADITHS AND THAT THEY HAVE NO SOUND PROOF FROM IT IN SUPPORT OF THEIR CREED

The Rafidi stated: "Shia Imamiyyah said: When we saw our opponents narrating these types of hadiths and we transmitted more than that from our reliable scholars, it became obligatory upon us to persist in our creed and it is prohibited for us to change our beliefs."

We reply to the above saying: Certainly, the utmost limit of what your reliable scholars transmitted is that they are similar to those who narrated these types of hadiths from among the Ahlus Sunnah. Thus, if the scholars of hadiths and its sciences knew out of necessity that those men are liars and that you are greater liars and more ignorant than them: It is forbidden upon you to act upon them and to pass verdicts with what they teaches and indicates. We will criticize your statement from many perspectives:

Firstly: We say to those Shia Rafidah: How do you arrive to the knowledge that those people of old who have transmitted those hadiths to you are reliable scholars? This is because you did not meet them, you do not know their conditions, you do not have books that have been written about their history by which you can be able to differentiate the reliable from the unreliable, and you do not have chain of authorities by which you can identify those who narrated the hadiths!^[200] Nay, your knowledge with most of what you possessed is like the knowledge of Jews and Christians with the knowledge of what they possessed. Nay, those people have books which has been written for them by their scholars (Hilal and Shammas) and their generality (masses) do not possess what contradict them. But with regard to you (Shia Rafidah), the generality of the Muslims are always disparaging your narrations and explaining your lies, while you do not have any knowledge about their condition.

Furthermore, it is known by concurrent reports that cannot be pushed away or ignored or covered that lies appeared among Shia

and they tell a lot of lies since the time of Ali up to today. You (Shia) knew that the scholars of hadith hated the Kharijites, and they have narrated regarding them (their false creeds) many sound hadiths from the Prophet (s.a.w): Bukhari has narrated some of it and Muslim has narrated ten of it; but still scholars of hadith accepts narrations from them and they consider as religious precepts whatever they assessed and found to be sound and reliable from the Prophet (s.a.w). Therefore, their hatred of the Kharijites did not make them tell lies against them, but they tested them and found them to be truthful. In contrast to Shia Rafidah, for the scholars of hadith, the jurists, the Muslims, the merchants, the armies, the masses (generality of the people) and whoever live with them or had any transaction with them in the past and in the present time, bear testimony that your sect is the greatest liar among all sects and if a person among you is found to be truthful; those who are truthful in other sects are more in number and if a liar is found in another sect; liars among you are greater in number.^[201] This fact cannot be hidden to any rational, intelligent, fair person. Whoever follows his vain desires has his heart blinded by Allah and whoever He send astray from the right path, you will never find for him a supporter or guide.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING ARGUMENTS OF THE RAFIDI WITH ASCETICISM OF ALI AS PROOF TO HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The fourth methodology: Proofs that showed his leadership that are extracted from his conditions (and characteristics) and they are twelve.”

The Rafidi mentioned that: “He is the most ascetic, the most devoted in worship, the most knowledgeable, and the bravest. He also mentioned some miracles of Ali and some virtues that showed that he is better than they are.” He thereafter stated:

The first evidence: “Certainly he is the most ascetic after the Prophet (s.a.w).”

We reply to the above contention saying: This premise is rejected. Certainly, the scholars who are learned and well informed about the condition of the Prophet’s companions and their traits are saying: The most ascetic companion after the Prophet (s.a.w) – the legal Islamic asceticism – is Abubakar, followed by Umar. This is because Abubakar is a merchant who earned a lot of money and he spent all of it in the path of Allah and for the sake of Allah. When he became the Caliph, he took his merchandise to the market, selling and earning a living. He met Umar while he is carrying garments for sale, and he (Umar) said to him: “Where are you going?” He replied him saying: “Do you think that I will stop seeking the sustenance of my family?” Abu Ubaidah and the Muhajirun were informed about what he said and they decided a salary for him. Abubakar made them swear and they (Umar and Ubaidullah) swore to him that it is legal for him to take two Dirhams every day (from the Muslim treasury as salary). After that, he deposited his property and wealth into the treasury. When he is about to die he commanded Aisha to return to the Muslim treasury whatever entered his personal wealth of the state properties. She found worn out velvet blanket that is not up to five Dirham (in value), an Ethiopian maid who is suckling his child, an Ethiopian slave and a Camel that is used in drawing water (for his

family). She sent all those things to Umar and Abdurrahman bin 'Auf said: "Do you deprive the family of Abubakar from those things? Umar replied him saying: "I swear by the Lord of the Ka'abah, Abubakar will not feel some guilt about them during his life and then, I bear their burden after his death."

Some scholars says: Ali was an ascetic, but Abubakar is more ascetic than him, because Abubakar possessed a lot of wealth at the beginning of Islam and a very extensive business, but he spent all in the path of Allah. His conduct as the Caliph has been mentioned, and he returned all the properties he left to the Muslim treasury.

Ibn Zanjaweih said: "Ali was in the beginning of Islam a poor man, who is taken care of and he does not take care of anybody. Thereafter (in Islam), he benefitted from properties: Lands, farms, palm trees, and endowments. When he was martyred, he has in his possession eighteen maids (slave women), and four wives; all of these are allowed and permissible – to Allah belongs all praises – and he did not command that what he left shall be returned to the State treasury. Hasan delivered a sermon after his death and said: "He did not left any gold or silver other than seven hundred Dirham that remained out of his grant."

Aswad bin 'Amir narrated from Sharik an-Nakh'i, from 'Asim bin Kulaib, from Muhammad bin Ka'ab al-Qurzi, who said: "Ali stated: 'I used to tie a stone to my stomach during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) due to intense hunger, but today the Zakat over my wealth has reached forty thousand Dirham.'" Ahmad has narrated it from Hajjaj bin Sharik and Ibrahim bin Sa'id al-Jawhari has narrated it and in his narration he mentioned that: "It reached four thousand Dinar." Thus, how can this be compared with asceticism of Abubakar, even though all of them are ascetics?

Ibn Hazm said: "Some people said, Ali is the most ascetic among them." He (Ibn Hazm) replied saying: "This ignorant man has told a lie. Our evidence to his being a liar is that asceticism is abstaining the soul from love of sound, wealth, renouncing pleasure in worldly things, and the tendency of having many children and servants. This

is what is meant by asceticism. With regard to the soul abstaining from wealth (accumulation), whoever has little knowledge of past history knew that Abubakar embraced Islam as wealthy man. It was said that he has Forty Thousand Dirham, and he spent all of it on the path of Allah. He freed the weak, the oppressed, and the tortured slaves for the sake of Allah up to the time he immigrated with the Prophet (s.a.w). Nothing remained of all his wealth except Six Thousand Dirham, and he took all of it to the Prophet (s.a.w) without leaving anything for his children and then he spent all of it on the path of Allah. Nothing remained of his wealth except a cloak-like woolen wrap; whenever he want to sit down he spread it out and whenever he want to move on he wears it. Some Prophet's companions became wealthy and possessed vast lands through legal means, but the person who preferred to spend it for the sake of Allah and on the path of Allah is more ascetic than the person who spent some and hold back some. When he became the Caliph, he did not take maids (slave women) and he did not expand his wealth. When death come to him, he returned what remained with him of his salary and what was provided to him by the state for the smooth running of affairs the Muslim; such as a camel, a slave, and a maid etc., he also asked to be returned to the state treasury what was given to him as his shares from the booties that are acquired from various battle fields with the Prophet (s.a.w). This is what is called asceticism from pleasures of the world and wealth. Nobody is close to him regarding asceticism among the Prophet's companions, neither Ali nor any other person, except Abu Dhar and Abu Ubaidah among the Muhajirun, the first and foremost Muslims, for those two men continued on the path which the Prophet (s.a.w) left them when he departed. Umar is the second person on asceticism after Abubakar; he is above Ali on shunning wealth and worldly pleasures. With regard to Ali: He really acquired wealth legally and he died leaving behind four wives and eighteen maids (slave women), in addition to slaves and servants. He died leaving behind twenty children (both males and females) and he left for them landed properties and real estates, thus, leaving them rich and wealthy

among the wealthy people of their time. This is well known matter that whoever has little knowledge of hadith and history cannot be able to deny. Among his landed properties is the Yanbu' which he gave out as charity and he used to harvest from it one thousand Wasaq (One Wasaq = 60 Sa's and 1 Sa'= 3 kg. approximately) of dates, in addition to other crops. Then, how can this be compared with that? With regard to love for children and inclining towards acquiring servants; the issue on this case is very clear and cannot be hidden to anyone who has little knowledge of hadith and history.

Abubakar has children and relatives such as Talha bin Ubaidullah, among the first and foremost Muslims, Muhajirun and who have great and outstanding works in all facets of virtues and activities, and such as his son Abdurrahman bin Abubakar. Abubakar has an old companionship with the Prophet (s.a.w), past migration and very clear, distinct virtues, but he never appoint any of them (his relatives) to any position of authority, in any region; such as Yemen which is a very a vast country with much responsibilities or Oman or Hadramaut or Yamamah, or Ta'if or Makka or Khaibar or any other part of the Arabian Peninsula; he hated nepotism and feared to be taken away by some vain desires or to incline towards it.

When Umar become the Caliph he followed the footsteps of Abubakar: He did not appoint anybody from his clan the Banu 'Ady bin Ka'ab, despite all the vastness of the Islamic State and its great size. It was during his time that Egypt, Syria, and the entire Persian kingdom up to Khorasan are conquered. He appointed Nu'aman bin 'Ady as governor of Mesan, but he quickly removed him. This, although his clan, the Banu 'Ady are foremost among all the Quraish clans on the issue of migration to Madina, for they all immigrated without leaving anybody in Makka. Among them are grand companions such as Sa'ad bin Zaid, one of the first and foremost immigrants to Madina and he has performed grand works for Islam. Others are Abi Jaham bin Huzaifah, Kharijah bin Huzaifa and his son Abdullah bin Umar. Furthermore, Abubakar did not appoint his son Abdurrahman bin Abubakar and he is one of the companions and Umar did not appoint his son neither during his life nor after his

death although he is among the best companions. Some people have accepted him to be appointed as their Caliph and he is suitable for the post and if Umar has appointed him, they will not reject him, but he did not do so.

We found that when Ali took over the Caliphate he appointed his relatives: He appointed Abdullah bin Abbas over Basrah, Ubaidullah bin Abbas over Yemen, Quthum and Ma'abad the children of Abbas over Makka and Madina, Ja'adah bin Hubairah, who is the son of his sister, Umm Hani bint Abi Talib over Khorasan as its governor, and Muhammad bin Abubakar,^[202] who is a son of his wife and a brother to his son over Egypt as its governor. He also accepted the selection of Hasan (his son) by the people to be the Caliph after him.^[203] We are not denying the suitability of Hasan or Abdullah bin Abbas to be the Caliph or to be the governor of Basrah! But we are saying: It is part of asceticism to deny children such as Abdullah bin Umar and Abdurrahman bin Abubakar the Caliphate even though people accepts them. The same thing can be said about denying close relatives such as Talha bin Ubaidullah and Sa'id bin Zaid from appointment as governors. Therefore, by sound necessary evidence, it has been proven that Abubakar is more ascetic than all the Prophet's companions, followed by Umar.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI HAS DIVORCED THE WORLD THRICE

The Rafidi stated: "Certainly, Ali has divorced the world thrice, his food used to be coarsely crushed wheat which he keep covered so that the two Caliphs will not pour broth inside it. He used to wear coarse, short clothes and his shirt is patched all over, to the extent that he feels shy about it. The suspenders of his sword and shoes are made of palm fibers.

Akhtab Khawarizim narrated from 'Ammar who said, 'I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying: 'O Ali! Allah has decorated you with an embellishment that is more beloved to Him: He made you renounce worldly pleasures and made it hateful to you. He made you love the poor and you are pleased with them as followers and they are pleased with you as their leader. O Ali! Success is for the person who loves you and believe in you, and damnation is for the person who hates you and disbelieve in you. The person who loves you and believe in you is your brother in religion and your partner in Paradise. As for the person who hates you and disbelieve in you, Allah has every right to make them stand in the grade of liars.'

Suwaid bin Ghafalah said: 'I entered before Ali after the second afternoon prayer ('Asr), I met him seated and before him is a container with hot milk and I feel its smell due its intense sourness. He held a loaf of bread, which has clear husk of wheat in it. sometimes he will break the bread with his hand and if it became so hard, he will use his knee to break it and then soak it in the milk. He said to me: 'Come forward and eat with me.' I replied that, I am fasting. He said: 'I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying: Whoever is prevented from food by fasting, Allah will certainly feed him from the foods of Paradise.' He said, I said to his maid: 'Woe to you O Fiddah! Why do not you fear Allah concerning this old man? Why do not you sieve and sift his food, for I am seeing husk in it? She said: 'He has commanded us not to sieve and sift his food for him.' He asked me: 'What did you say to her? I informed him. He said to me: 'The food of

the Prophet (s.a.w) is not sieved and sifted and he never eats his fill from wheat bread for three consecutive day until he died.'

One day Ali bought two coarse clothes and he asked his servant Qambar to choose one, and after he chose, Ali wore the other one. When he wore it its sleeves are longer than his fingers and he cut up the extra length.

After Ali died , Mu`awiyah bin Abi Sufyan said to Dirar bin Damrah "Describe 'Ali to me." "Will you not excuse me from answering you," said Dirar. "No, describe him," insisted Mu`awiyah. "Please excuse me from doing so," said Dirar. "I will not," said Mu`awiyah. "I will do so, then" said Dirar with a sigh. "By Allah, he was (far-sighted) and very strong. He spoke with a truthful finality, so that, through him , truth became distinguished from falsehood. He ruled justly, and knowledge gushed forth from him, as did wisdom. He felt an aversion to the world and its (pleasure). He was comfortable with the night and its darkness (meaning he prayed a lot in the night). By Allah he would cry profusely (from fear of Allah); long durations would he spend in contemplation, during which time he would converse with his soul. He showed a liking to coarse garments and lower-quality food. By Allah, it was as if – in his humbleness- he was one of us: when we asked him a question, he would answer us; when we would go to him, he would initiate (the greeting); and when we would invite him (to our homes), he would come to us. Yet, in spite of his closeness to us, we would not speak (freely) with him, because of the dignity and honor that he exuded if he smiled, he revealed the likes of straight and regular pearls(his teeth). He honored religious people and loved the poor. The strong person could not hope to gain favors from him through falsehood. And the weak person never lost hope of his justness. I swear, by Allah, that on certain occasions, I saw him in his place of prayer when the night was dark and few stars could be seen; he would be holding his beard and crying the way a very sad person cries; and I would hear him saying, "O world, O world, are you offering yourself to me? Do you desire me? Never! Never! Deceive someone other than me, I have divorced you for the third time, so that you cannot return to me

(metaphorically, of course; he is alluding to the fact that, in Islam, the third divorce is final) your life is short, the existence you offer is base, and your danger is great. Alas for the scarcity of sustenance (good deeds), the great distance of the journey, and the loneliness of the road!"

Upon hearing this description, Mu`awiyah's eyes swelled with tears, and not being able to hold them from gushing forth, he was forced to wipe them with his cuffs; and the same can be said for those who were present. Mu`awiyah then said, "May Allah have mercy on the father of Al-Hasan, for he was, by Allah, just as you described him to be." He then said, "O Dirar, describe your sadness at having lost him." "My sadness" began Dirar "is like the sadness of a woman who cannot control her tears or allay her grief after her child, while in her lap, has just been slaughtered." Dirar then stood up and left."

We reply that: We have no doubt that Ali is an ascetic, but we disagree that he is more ascetic than Abubakar and Umar. All what he has mentioned has not proved his claims and contention. Nay, what is true in his statement does not contain any proof to what he is claiming or trying to prove and the rest are either lies or statements that contain nothing praiseworthy in them.

With regard to the statement that he has divorced the world thrice; it is well known that he has stated: "O you world, I have divorced you thrice. Deceive someone else, I will never return to you again" (Al-Fawaid, pg. 86). But this does not prove that he is more ascetic than the person who did not say that. Certainly, our Prophet (s.a.w), Jesus (a.s) son of Mary and other people are more ascetic than him, but they never make similar statements. It is not obligatory upon a person who is an ascetic to announce that: "I am an ascetic," and not everybody who says he is an ascetic is actually an ascetic. Therefore, lack of making this statement does not indicate lack of asceticism and making the statement does not prove asceticism. Therefore, there is no proof in this statement.

The Rafidi claimed that: "He always eats coarse bread of wheat without broth." We reply that: There is no proof to this statement due to two reasons:

Firstly: This is a lie.

Secondly: This is not a commendable conduct, for the Messenger of Allah is the leader of the ascetics and he does not reject eating what he get and he does not overburden himself to acquire what he does not have. Nay, if he gets meat of chicken he will eat it, if he gets meat of goat he will eat it and if he get sweet or honey or fruit he will eat them and if he did not get anything he will not overtask himself. If he gets food and he like it he will eat it and if he did not like it he will leave it. He will not overburden himself on what he does not have. Sometimes he ties a stone over his stomach due to intense hunger. A month or two can pass without a fire being lighted in his house (to cook some food).

The Rafidi stated: "The suspender of his shoes and swords are made of palm fibers." We reply that: This is also a lie and it is not a praiseworthy conduct. It was reported that the shoes of the Prophet (s.a.w) are made from leather and the suspenders of his sword are made from gold and silver. Allah has made sustenance plentiful for him and therefore, what praiseworthy conduct can he obtain by abandoning leather although it is available? This conduct can be commended if there is scarcity Narrated Abu Umama: ***"Some people conquered many countries and their swords were decorated neither with gold nor silver, but they were decorated with leather, lead and iron" (Bukhari).*** And in another hadith: Narrated Abu Huraira: ***"Allah's Apostle sent Aban from Medina to Najd as the commander of a Sariya. Aban and his companions came to the Prophet at Khaibar after the Prophet had conquered it, and the reins of their horses were made of the fibers of date palm trees" (Bukhari).***

The hadith of 'Ammar is among the fabricated lies and the hadith of Suwaid bin Ghafalah is not ascribed to the Prophet (s.a.w). The hadith in which Ali bought clothes is well known. The hadith of Dirar has been reported and none of those hadiths shows that he is more ascetic than Abubakar and Umar. Nay, whoever knew the narrated history of Umar, his justice, his asceticism, his refusal to appoint his relatives to positions of authority, his reduction of the grants of his

son to lesser than those of his equals, his reduction of the grants of his daughter to less of her equals and his eating coarse food although he is the one who shared war booties of the Persian and the Roman Kingdoms; what Ali used to share is only a fraction of the conquest of Umar and that Umar died while he is indebted to the turn of Eighty Thousand Dirham;[\[204\]](#) by all these it will be clear to you that Umar is more ascetic than Ali and undoubtedly, Abubakar is more ascetic than Umar.

SEGMENT: ASCETICISM DOES NOT PROVE THAT A PERSON DESERVED LEADERSHIP IN CONTRAST TO THE CLAIMS OF THE RAFIDI

The Rafidi stated: “Summarily nobody is close to him in asceticism and nobody preceded him in it. Therefore, since he is the most ascetic, he shall be the leader because the inferior (person) has not preceded him (and shall not be placed above him).”

We reply that: “All the two premises (or issues) are false: He is not more ascetic than Abubakar. Furthermore, it is not an established rule that whoever is more ascetic deserved to be the leader more than anyone else. It has been explained that Ali has a lot of wealth and maids (slave girls) and his family too possessed wealth the like of which is not acquired by Abubakar and Umar.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ACTS OF WORSHIP OF ALI PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The second evidence: Ali is the most devoted worshipper than all of them: He fast in the day and pray throughout the night. People learn from him night and day supererogatory prayers, most of his acts of worship and acts of supplications can take time to be enumerated (or recited). He used to pray in the day and night one thousand units of prayer. He never failed to pray night supererogatory prayers even during battles.

Ibn Abbas said: ‘I saw him during one of his wars studying the sun. I asked him: O commander of the faithfuls! What are you doing?’ He replied: ‘I am looking out to see the diversion of the sun from the middle of the sky, so that I can pray.’ I asked him again: ‘At this moment (of war)?’ He replied: ‘Certainly, we are fighting them in order to establish prayer.’ Therefore, he never abandon carrying out acts of worship in the first periods of their entry time and in the most difficult times.

Whenever they want to remove a piece of iron that is stuck in his body, they leave him until he faced his Lord and is engrossed in prayer. At that moment he will be unmindful of anything other than praying and he will not feel the pains of their actions while removing the pieces of iron. He joined prayer and Zakat by giving charity while he was in bowing position and Allah revealed verses of the Qur’an that are being recited (because of that act of worship). He gave his food and that of his family to the poor and the needy for three consecutive days and Allah revealed Chapter 76 (Insan) of the Qur’an. He gave charity day and night, secretly and openly. He sought private consultation with the Prophet (s.a.w) and gave charity before the consultation and Allah revealed some verses concerning that. He freed one thousand slaves from what his hand has earned. He worked as a laborer and spent what he has earned on the Prophet (s.a.w) while he is in Shi’ab (in Makka during sanctions).

Since he is the most devoted person on act of worship, he shall be the leader.”

We reply saying: This statement contained many fabricated lies that can only be hidden to the most ignorant person on the condition, conducts, and history of the Prophet’s companions. Although they are lies, they do not contain anything praiseworthy.

The Rafidi stated: “He used to fast all days and pray all nights.” We reply that: This is a lie against him. It comes in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“But I fast and break my fast, I pray in the night and sleep and I marry women. Thus, whoever abandons my Sunnah is not of me” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** In a sound hadith, narrated ***‘Ali bin Abi Talib One night Allah’s Apostle came to me and Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet and asked, “Won’t you pray (at night)?” I said, “O Allah’s Apostle! Our souls are in the hands of Allah and if He wants us to get up He will make us get up.” When I said that, he left us without saying anything and I heard that he was hitting his thigh and saying, “But man is more quarrelsome than anything.” (18.54).*** This hadith proved that he used to sleep in the night, for the Prophet (s.a.w) come and wake him up, but he argued with him to the extent that he turned away reciting: ***“But man is more quarrelsome than anything.” (18.54).***

The Rafidi stated: “It is from him that people learned night and day supererogatory prayers.” We reply that: If he means by this statement that some people learned them from him! Then, the same thing could be said about all the companions, for they taught some people. And if he means that the Muslims learned them from him! Then, this is a reckless lie, for most of the Muslims have not seen him and they used to pray in the night and pray supererogatory prayers in the day time. When most of the Muslims countries are opened during the time of Umar and Uthman, such as Syria, North Africa, Khorasan and beyond; how can they learn from him? The Prophet’s companions used to teach others during his lifetime and it is from him (the Prophet) that they learned those acts of worship. This claim (of the Rafidi) can only be suitable if applied to the people of Kufa. It is well known that the people of Kufa learned their religion

from Abdullah bin Mas'ud and other companions (for many years) before Ali come to the city. They (Ibn Mas'ud and other companions) are among the perfect people in knowledge and religion before the coming of Ali to Kufa. The Prophet's companions are always like that and the students of Ibn Mas'ud have also been teaching religious precepts before Ali come to Iraq.

The Rafidi stated: "Acts of supplications that are acquired from him can take long time (before being finished)." We reply that: Most of those supplications are lies against him and it is below his status to supplicate with those prayers that are not suitable to his condition and the condition of the Prophet's companions. All those supplications do not have chains of authorities. Sound and reliable supplication of the Prophet (s.a.w) are better than the supplications that anybody has supplicated with. The best people in the Islamic community from the first to the last are supplicating with the supplications of their Prophet (s.a.w).

The Rafidi stated: "He used to pray through the day and night one thousand units of prayers." We reply that: This is a lie and there is nothing commendable in it, for the sum total units of prayers of the Prophet (s.a.w) by day and night are forty units of prayer, comprising both the obligatory and the supererogatory. Time will not be spacious enough for a leader of Muslims in addition to ruling people and administrating their affairs – to pray one thousand units of prayer, except if he prays the way a raven picks its food and such is the prayer of the hypocrites; Allah has absolved and protected Ali from such conduct.

It come in sound hadith that during the battle of Siffin he used to recite the remembrance of Allah that the Prophet (s.a.w) taught Fatima. He said: "I never abandon it since I heard it from the Prophet (s.a.w)." He was asked: "Even in the night of Siffin?" He replied: "Even in the night of Siffin, I remembered it before down and recited it."[\[205\]](#)

What he said about removing piece of iron that stuck in his body is a lie. It is not known that iron has entered and stuck into the body of Ali. What he said about Ali joining prayer and Zakat is also a lie, as

explained already and there is nothing commendable in it.; if it is a recommended act of worship it will be mentioned in the laws of Islam. If it is recommended that Muslims shall pay Zakat (or give charity) while they are praying, they will have done so. Since nobody among the Muslims have recommended it, we knew that it is not an act of worship and nay, it is a detestable act.

What the Rafidi mentioned concerning Ali giving his food and that of his family to the needy for three consecutive days and that he gave charity of four Dirham in the night and day, secretly and openly are all lies, as already explained. There is nothing praiseworthy in such acts.

The Rafidi stated: "He freed one thousand slaves from what his hands has earned." We reply that: This is a lie that can only be spread among the most ignorant people. Certainly, Ali never freed one thousand slaves, nay not even one hundred. Ali do not have means of earning with his hands what can free one tenth of what he has mentioned; he does not have a trade that he is practicing and he is busy either with Jihad and other things.

The Rafidi stated: "He used to work as a laborer and spend the money on the Prophet (s.a.w) while he was in Shi'ab." We reply that: This is a lie from many angles:

Firstly: They do not used to go out of the Shi'ab and there is nobody in the Shi'ab who can employ him.

Secondly: His father Abu Talib is together with them in the Shi'ab and he used to spend on him.

Thirdly: Khadijah is a rich woman who is spending from her wealth.

Fourthly: Ali never work as laborer in Makka and he was a little child when they are in the Shi'ab. At that time he is either an adolescent or has reached the age of puberty. Therefore, Ali is among those who are feed while in the Shi'ab, either by his father or by the Prophet (s.a.w) and he is not among those who can feed themselves. Thus, how can he spend on another person?

SEGMENT: CRITIQUE OF THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI IS THE MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE COMPANION

The Rafidi stated: “The third evidence: He is the most knowledgeable person after the Prophet (s.a.w).”

We reply that: Certainly, Ahlus Sunnah rejects this statement and they are saying that: Undoubtedly, the most knowledgeable after the Prophet (s.a.w) is Abubakar, followed by Umar. Many scholars have mentioned the consensus of Ahlus Sunnah, that Abubakar is the most learned among the companions and evidences that prove that are mentioned in relevant places. Certainly, nobody used to give religious verdicts, pass judgments, and deliver sermons in the presence of the Prophet (s.a.w) except Abubakar. Nothing became doubtful to the companions concerning the affairs of their religion, but that Abubakar will explain it to them. They fall into ambiguity about the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) and Abubakar explained it to them. They fall into ambiguity about where to bury him and he explained it to them. They doubted fighting those who refused to pay Zakat and Abubakar explained it to them. He explained to them the meaning of the words of Allah: **“Indeed Allah shall fulfill the true vision which He showed to His Messenger (SAW) [i.e. the Prophet a dream that he has entered Makka along with his companions, having their (head) hair shaved and cut short] in very truth. Certainly, you shall enter AlMasjidAlHaram; if Allah wills, secure, (some) having your heads shaved, and (some) having your head hair cut short, having no fear. He knew what you knew not, and He granted besides that a near victory” (48:27).** He explained to them the statement of the Prophet: **“Allah has given one of His Slaves the choice of receiving the splendor and luxury of the worldly life whatever he likes or to accept the good (of the Hereafter) which is with Allah. So he has chosen that good which is with Allah” (Bukhari).** He explained to them the al-Kalalah (those who leave neither descendants nor ascendants as heirs) and they did not differ with him. Ali and other

companions used to narrate hadiths from Abubakar. It comes in Sunan:

Asma' bint al-Hakam said: I heard Ali say: ***I was a man; when I heard a tradition from the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him), Allah benefited me with it as much as He willed. But when some one of his companions narrated a tradition to me I adjured him. When he took an oath, I testified him. AbuBakr narrated to me a tradition, and AbuBakr narrated truthfully. He said: I heard the apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) saying: When a servant (of Allah) commits a sin, and he performs ablution well, and then stands and prays two rak'ahs, and asks pardon of Allah, Allah pardons him. He then recited this verse: "And those who, when they commit indecency or wrong their souls, remember Allah" (3:134) (Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud).***

No one among the respectable Muslim scholars has said that 'Ali was more knowledgeable or had more understanding of Islam than Abubakar and 'Umar, or even than Abubakar alone. Those who claim that there is consensus on that are among the most ignorant of people and the greatest liars. Rather, more than one of the scholars have stated that there is scholarly consensus that Abubakar was more knowledgeable than 'Ali, such as Imam Mansur ibn 'Abd al-Jabbar al-Sam'ani al-Marwadhi, one of the leading scholars of the Sunnah among the companions of al-Shafa'i, who mentioned in his book Taqweem al-Adillah 'ala'l-Imam that there was consensus among the scholars of the Sunnah that Abubakar was more knowledgeable than 'Ali. I do not know of anyone among the famous Imams who disputes this point. How could it be otherwise when Abubakar used to issue rulings, commands, and prohibitions, and pass judgments, and deliver sermons in the presence of the Prophet (s.a.w), as he used to do when he and Abubakar would go out to call the people to Islam, and when they migrated together, and on the day of Hunain, and on other occasions, when the Prophet (s.a.w) remained silent and approved of what Abubakar said; no one else enjoyed such status. When the Prophet (s.a.w) consulted with the

wise and knowledgeable men among his companions, he would consult Abubakar and 'Umar first, because they were the first to speak about matters of Islam in the presence of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) before the rest of his companions; for example when he consulted them about the prisoners of Badr, the first ones who spoke about that were Abubakar and 'Umar, and this also happened on other occasions... In Sahih Muslim it is narrated that the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w) were with him on a journey and he said: ***"If the people obey Abu Bakr and 'Umar, they will be guided aright."*** And it was narrated from Ibn 'Abbas that he used to give his religious verdicts based on the Book of Allah, and if he could not find anything then he would look at the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), then if he could not find anything he would refer to the religious verdicts of Abubakar and 'Umar, then if he did not find anything he would refer to the religious verdicts 'Uthman and 'Ali – and Ibn 'Abbas was the scholar of the Islamic community and the most knowledgeable of the Sahaba (companions) of his time, and he would consult the words of Abubakar and 'Umar and give them precedence over the words of anyone else among the companions. And it was proven that the Prophet (s.a.w) prayed for Ibn 'Abbas and said, ***"O Allah, cause him to understand the religion of Islam and teach him the correct interpretation (of the Qur'an)."***

The Rafidi stated: "The Prophet said: The most learned judge among you is Ali," and being a judge requires religion and knowledge."

We reply that: This hadith is not sound and it does not have any reliable chain of authority that can be considered as evidence in religion. The statement of the Prophet (s.a.w): ***"The most learned among you regarding the permissible and the forbidden is Mu'az bin Jabal"*** (Tirmidhi), has stronger chain of authority. And the knowledge of the allowed and the forbidden is suitable in giving judgment in a greater measure than teaching the allowed and the forbidden. The second hadith has been narrated by Ahmad and Tirmidhi, and the first hadith has not been narrated in any known book of Sunan and Masanid, and it has neither a sound chain of authority, nor a weak one. A person who is known to be a liar

narrated it. The hadith: "I am the city of knowledge and Ali is its gate," is weaker and flimsier than it, although it was narrated by Tirmidhi. Ibn Jawzi mentioned it and explained that all its chains of authorities are fabricated. That this hadith is fabricated is very clear from its text, for if the Prophet (s.a.w) is the city of knowledge and the city has only one gate, the affairs of Islam will be ruined. This is why Muslims have had consensus, that it is forbidden and rejected to say that only one person can convey Islam from the Prophet (s.a.w). Nay, it is necessary and obligatory that Islam is conveyed from the Prophet (s.a.w) through concurrent transmitters in such a way that the knowledge transmitted will entail certainty to those who receive it.

If Shia Rafidah say: The lone person is infallible and thus, certain knowledge can be attained through his report and conveyance!

We reply that: It is necessary that he is known to be infallible in the first instance. His being infallible cannot be attested by his statement, before he is known to be infallible otherwise that will entail a vicious circle. It cannot be affirmed by consensus because there is no consensus on it. Furthermore, according to Shia Imamiyyah consensus can only be a proof, if there is among them (the scholars) an infallible Imam. This entailed that his infallibility can only be upheld through his claim. It is well known that if the claimed infallibility is true, it is necessary to know it through another source and not through his statement. If the city of knowledge does not have any door except him; nothing can soundly be attested, neither his infallibility, nor anything among the religious precepts. Thus, it is known that this hadith has been fabricated by an ignorant Zindiq, who think that it is a form of commending Ali or expounding his virtues, while in reality this is a door of Zandaqah on disparaging the religion of Islam. Only one person transmits this hadith. Furthermore, this has contradicted what is known through concurrent reports, because Islam reached all regions, countries, and cities of the Muslim countries (and beyond) through other companions and not Ali.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE VERSE OF KEEN EAR WAS REVEALED CONCERNING ALI

The Rafidi stated: “It is concerning Ali that Allah revealed: **‘That We might make it a remembrance for you, and the keen ear (person) may (hear and) understand it’ (69:12).**”

We reply that: The hadith is fabricated by the consensus of scholars of hadith. It is well known out of necessity that Allah does not mean by this just one ear among all ears,^{[\[206\]](#)} He also do not mean the ear of a specific person. What is meant is type of ear and thus it encompassed all keen ears.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED THE INTELLIGENCE OF ALI AND HIS REMAINING WITH THE PROPHET AT ALL TIMES

The Rafidi stated: “Ali is very intelligent and he has intense desire to learn. He remained attached to the Prophet (s.a.w) a perfect attachment more than anyone else did. He remains with him day and night since he was a child up to the time the Prophet (s.a.w) died.”

We reply that: How did he know that Ali is more intelligent than Abubakar and Umar and that he desired learning more than them? It comes in sound hadiths that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: , **“Amongst the people preceding you there used to be 'Muhaddithun' (i.e. persons who can guess things that come true later on, as if those persons have been inspired by a divine power), and if there are any such persons amongst my followers, it is 'Umar bin Al-Khattab” (Bukhari).** In another hadith, Aisha said, the Prophet (s.a.w) used to say: **“In the communities that passed before you, there used to be Muhaddithun, if there is any of them in my community it will be Umar” (Bukhari, Muslim).** In a version in Bukhari the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **“In the past among the Banu Isra’il there are men who speak without being prophets, so if they exist among my community, it is Umar.”** Al-Muhaddith is the person who is inspired by Allah and this is an addition to human knowledge.

Certainly, Abubakar used to accompany and remain with the Prophet (s.a.w) more than Ali and all the companions. Abubakar and Umar used to meet with the prophet (s.a.w) and he used to discuss with them the affairs of the Muslims. The truth is with Umar on majority of issues over which he and Ali differed, such as the issue of a pregnant woman whose husband has died.

*** Abdullah bin Mas’ud said: I think when Umar died, he went with ninth parts of knowledge and he shared with people the remaining one tenth.”

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MENTIONED A MAXIM THINKING THAT IT IS A HADITH

The Rafidi stated: “The Prophet (s.a.w) has said: ‘learning of a child is like engraving on a stone.’ Therefore, his knowledge will be more than that of other people, due to perfect receptivity (of a child) and complete efficacy.”

We reply that: This showed that the Rafidi has no knowledge of hadith. This is just a maxim that is spoken by people and it is not part of any speech of the Prophet (s.a.w). Allah, the Most High, aids his companions; they learned beliefs, the Qur’an and the Sunnah and Allah made learning easy for them. The same thing applies to Ali, for the revelation of the Qur’an was not complete until he reached the age of thirty years. Thus, he memorized most of it as an adult and not as a child. Scholars have differed on the issue of his memorization of the whole Qur’an on two opinions.

The Prophets of Allah are the most knowledgeable people of All Allah’s created beings and they are not sent as Prophet’s until after forty years – with the exception of Jesus. The teachings of the Prophet (s.a.w) are open, general, and unrestricted, he never made it exclusive or restricted to anybody; but every student learns according to his ability and capability. This is why Abu Huraira memorized from the Prophet (s.a.w) a lot of hadith within three years and some months what has not been memorized by many people. Abubakar used to accompany the Prophet (s.a.w) and remain with him more than all the companions.

The Rafidi stated: “People learned sciences from him.” We reply that: This statement is false, because the people of Kufa, - which is his city – have learned beliefs, the Qur’an, exegesis of the Qur’an, jurisprudence and the Sunnah from Ibn Mas’ud and other companions (who settled in Iraq) before Ali come to Kufa. If it is said: Abu Abdurrahman recited the Qur’an before him, it means that he presented it to him as a form of reviewing, because he has already memorized the whole Qur’an before Ali come to Kufa.

*** Furthermore, if you mean that some Muslims learned from him! We say that: This is right, because the elders teaches their followers. If you mean that everybody learned from him! Then, this is a reckless lie, for his brothers the Prophet's companions took their religion and knowledge from their Prophet (s.a.w). With regard to the Tabi'un; most of them have never seen him (let alone take knowledge from him).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI STATED THAT ALI CREATED ARABIC GRAMMAR

The Rafidi stated: “Ali created the Arabic grammar. He said to Abu Aswad: ‘All speech contained three things; noun, verb, and letter.’ And he taught him the approaches to prosody.”

We reply that: Firstly, this is not among the knowledge of Prophethood; it is a science that can be deduced and a form of protecting the grammar of the language upon which the Qur’an was revealed. There are no grammatical mistakes during the first three Caliphs and thus, this science is not needed. When Ali settled in Kufa and among its inhabitants, there are none Arabs, it was said that he instructed Abu Aswad al-Duali saying: “Speech contained noun, verb and letter, therefore, follow this path.” Thus, he did this due to need, in the same manner that after Ali some symbols were created for letters such as dots and signs of intonations and stress. The Arabic grammarians of Kufa and Basrah expanded the Arabic grammar after Ali and Khalil bin Ahmad created the science of prosody (metrics).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT JURISTS REFER TO ALI

The Rafidi stated: “In jurisprudence the jurists used to refer to Ali.” We reply that: This is a clear lie. Nobody among the four Imam or other scholars among the jurists are referring to him in their jurisprudence.

*** Imam Malik received his jurisprudence from the people of Madina and it is very rare to find the people of Madina taking the statements of Ali. They generally take their knowledge from Umar, Zaid, Abdullah bin Umar, and other companions. Imam Shafi'i learned jurisprudence from the scholars of Makka and especially the students of Ibn Juraih and Ibn Juraih is a student of the students of Abdullah bin Abbas. After that, he went to Madina and received knowledge from Imam Malik. Thereafter, he studied the books of the scholars of Iraq and chose a methodology for himself. Abu Hanifa is a close student of Hammad bin Abu Sulaiman, the student of Ibrahim an-Nakh'i, and Ibrahim is a student of 'Alqama and 'Alqama took knowledge from Abdullah bin Mas'ud. Abu Hanifa also took knowledge from 'Ata bin Abi Rabah and other scholars in Makka. Ahmad bin Hanbal took the methodology of the scholars of hadith. He received knowledge from Hushaim, Ibn 'Uyainah, Waki'i, Shafi'i, and other scholars and thereafter, he chose a path for himself. This is what Ibn Rahaweh and Abu Ubaidah did.

The Rafidi stated: “Certainly, the Malikiyyah school of jurisprudence took their knowledge from his (Ali) children.”

We reply that: This is a lie. Before us is the Muwatta of Imam Malik and it does not contain anything from his children except a little. The same could be said about the books of Sunan and Masanid; most of what is in those books of knowledge is not from the Prophet's household.

The Rafidi stated: certainly, Abu Hanifa learned from Imam Sadiq.”

We reply that: This is a lie, for he is age mate (his peer) and he (Ja'afar as-Sadiq) died before him with two years. Abu Hanifa and Ja'afar as-Sadiq are born in the same year and there is nothing to

prove that he has learned even one issue, either from him or his father. Abu Hanifa took knowledge from those who are older than them (al-Baqir and as-Sadiq), such as 'Ata bin Abi Rabah and his main teacher is Hammad bin Abu Sulaiman. Furthermore, Ja'afar bin Muhammad as-Sadiq live in Madina.

The Rafidi stated: "Certainly, Imam Shafi'i took knowledge from Muhammad bin Hasan."

We reply that: This is a lie for the time Shafi'i met him, he is already an Imam (a jurist consult). He sat before him, knew his methodology, debated him, and wrote a book replying him (and correcting him). Summarily, those Imams (jurist consults) did not learn from Ja'afar as-Sadiq any issue, neither in the branches of religion, nor in the principles of religion, but they narrated from him some few hadiths and they narrated from other than him many more hadiths. There is nobody who has been lied against by fabricators of hadith like Ja'afar as-Sadiq, although he is free and absolved from what is lied against him. The fabricators ascribed to him the science of Battaqah (bitaqah – calling cards), Haft (wrecking), Jadwal, Ikhtilaj al-A'ada'a (causing convulsion of the body), Jifr, Manafi'ul Qur'an (benefits of the Qur'an), Ru'ud, Buruq, laws of astrology (prediction of the future from the stars), Qur'at, Malah and Istiqsam bil 'Azlam (use arrows for seeking for luck or making decisions).

The rafidi stated: "Imam Malik took knowledge from Rabi'ah, and Rabi'ah took knowledge from Ikrimah and Ikrimah took knowledge from Abdullah bin Abbas and Ibn Abbas is the student of Ali."

We reply that: This is a lie, for Rabi'ah never learns anything from Ikrimah. He learned from Sa'id bin Musayyib and Sa'id bin Musayyib refers his knowledge to Umar, Zaid, and Abu Huraira. The statement that Ibn Abbas is a student of Ali is false, for his narrations on the authority of Ali are very little. Ibn Abbas received most of his knowledge from Umar and Zaid and he used to give religious verdicts with opinions of Abubakar and Umar, and he used to differ with Ali on many issues.

The Rafidi stated: "The science of exegesis of the Qur'an is attributed to him because Ibn Abbas was his student on it. Ibn Abbas

said: "Commander of the faithfuls (Ali) taught me the interpretation of the letter Bi (ب In the) which is in the phrase 'in the name of Allah,' from the beginning of the night up to the morning."

We reply that: This is a clear lie, and this is usually narrated by those who narrates myths among the ignorant ascetics. In the same manner they used to narrate that Umar bin Khattab, said: "The Prophet (s.a.w) used to speak to Abubakar and I am like a none Arab between them." They also transmits that Umar married the wife of Abubakar, in order to ask her concerning his secret duties and she said: "I used to smell from him the scent of roasted liver." And this a very, apparent lie, for the person who married the wife of Abubakar after his death – Asma'u bint Umais – is Ali bin Abi Talib. Abdullah received knowledge from numerous companions and he learned the science of exegesis of the Qur'an from Abdullah bin Mas'ud and from a group of the companions... There is no known established exegesis of the Qur'an in the Islamic community on the authority of Ali, and what has been narrated from him concerning it is very little. All what has been narrated by Abu Abdurrahman as-Salmi, the ascetic concerning the realities of interpretation of the Qur'an on the authority of Ja'afar as-Sadid are lies and fabrications.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT BRAVERY OF ALI PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The fourth evidence: He is the bravest among them and it is by his sword that the principles of Islam are established and the pillars of religion are erected. He is never defeated in any place and he never hit with his sword except that he cut up (the target). In many instances, he repelled attacks on the Prophet and he never fled from the battlefield as others have done. He protected him with his body when he slept on his bed covering himself with his blanket and the polytheists thought that he is the one sleeping. The polytheists have agreed upon killing the Prophet (s.a.w) and they continued to watch him with their weapons waiting for the coming of dawn, so that they can kill him in clear daylight and his blood will go un-avenged, for Banu Hashim will see that he has been killed by all the tribes. With this plan, Banu Hashim cannot be able to take revenge for all the Quraish clans have participated in his blood and all the clans will fight them to protect its men.

With this strategy (of Ali sleeping on his bed) the blood of the Prophet (s.a.w) was protected, he was saved, and he continued to deliver the religion of Islam. In the morning, they decided to attack him. He (Ali) charged against them and they dispersed and went away, when they found that it is he. Thus, their plan was defeated and their stratagem destroyed.”

The answer to the above claim is that: Certainly, Ali is among the brave companions and he is among those who aided Islam with his efforts and Jihad, among the first and foremost Muslims of the Muhajirun and Ansar. He is also among the chiefs of those who believe in Allah and the Last Day and among those who killed unbelievers with their swords: But these are not his exclusive virtues and outstanding works, nay, many among the companions have also performed those outstanding works and attained those grand virtues. Therefore, these cannot prove his precedence in Jihad over many men among the companions. Thus, how can it prove that he is the best among the Caliphs?

The Rafidi stated: "He is the bravest among them." We reply that: This is a lie. Nay, the bravest person is the Messenger of Allah as narrated in sound hadiths that was narrated by Anas: ***The 'Prophet was the best and the bravest amongst the people. Once the people of Medina got terrified at night, so they went in the direction of the noise (that terrified them). The Prophet met them (on his way back) after he had found out the truth. He was riding an unsaddled horse belonging to Abu Talha and a sword was hanging by his neck, and he was saying, "Don't be afraid! Don't be afraid!" He further said, "I found it (i.e. the horse) very fast," or said, "This horse is very fast" (Bukhari).*** The hadith come in Muslim as follows: Anas bin Malik reported that: ***"Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) was the sublimest among people (in character) and the most generous amongst them and he was the bravest of men. One night the people of Medina felt disturbed and set forth in the direction of a sound when Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) met them on his way back as he had gone towards that sound ahead of them. He was on the horse of Abu Talha which had no saddle over it, and a sword was slung round his neck, and he was saying: There was nothing to be afraid of, and he also said: We found it (this horse) like a torrent of water (indicating its swift-footedness), whereas the horse had been slow before that time" (Muslim).***

In another sound hadith it comes as follows: ***"It has been narrated (through a different chain of transmitters) by Abu Ishiq that a person said to Bara' (b. 'Azib): Abu Umara, did you flee on the Day of Hunain? He replied: The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) did not retreat. (What actually happened was that some hasty young men who were either inadequately armed or were unarmed met a group of men from Banu Hawazin and Banu Nadir who happened to be (excellent) archers. The latter shot at them a volley of arrows that did not miss. The people turned to the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him). Abu Sufyan b. Harith was leading his mule. So he got down, prayed and invoked God's help. He said: I am the Prophet. This is no***

untruth. I am the son of Abd al-Muttalib. O God, descend Thy help. Bara' continued: When the battle grew fierce. we, by God. would seek protection by his side, and the bravest among us was he who confronted the onslaught and it was the Holy Prophet (may peace be upon him)" (Muslim). It come in Musnad of Imam Ahmad that Ali said: "When the fighting grew intense on the day of Badr we sought shelter by drawing closer to the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam), who was one of the strongest of men, and no was closer to the disbeliever than him." (Bukhari, Muslim). Ali and other companions used to find refuge and cover with the Prophet (s.a.w), because he is the bravest of them, even though one of them has killed with his hand more than the people killed by the Prophet (s.a.w).

Ibn Hazm said: We see that they claim that 'Ali was the greatest in waging Jihad against disbelievers and attacking and fighting them among all the companions. Abu Muhammad (Ibn Hazm) said: This is wrong as the Jihad is classified in three categories;

One of them is calling towards Allah.

Second is to do Jihad during war by ideas and strategies.

And the third is to do jihad with hands by killing and hitting.

We find that with regards to the first type of Jihad no person supersede Abubakar and 'Umar after the Messenger of Allah (s.aw). As for Abubakar then we find that the senior companions accepted Islam on his hands. As compared to him, 'Ali does not have much share in this. As for 'Umar then we see that the day he became Muslim Islam was strengthened and the worship of Allah was being done openly. This is the greatest Jihad and these two persons were alone in such Jihad of the first two categories (during early days) which has no comparable and 'Ali does not have participation in it.

With regards to the second category then we find that it is specifically for Abubakar and then for 'Umar.

As for the third category which is stabbing, hitting, and combating, then we find that it is the lowest level of Jihad because of the obvious reason that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), with the

agreement of Muslims, was selective in doing the most virtuous of the act and we see that his (s.a.w) Jihad in most of the cases was restricted within the first two categories which is to call towards Allah – the Mighty and Majestic – and planning and forwarding. His least involvement (among the three categories) was in stabbing, hitting, and combating. This is not because of cowardice but in reality, he was absolutely the bravest of all earthly beings with his hands and soul and the most complete to attain succor. But he would look for the best and then next after it from the acts, and then he would prefer it and get involved with it. We find that, during the Badr and other battles, Abubakar would not leave him and sometimes even ‘Umar was included in it. They were distinguished in this case unlike ‘Ali and all other companions, except in rare cases.

Then after that, we ponder over the third category of Jihad, which is to stab, to hit, and to combat. We see that ‘Ali was not alone in this, but many other companions also had the same share like Talha, Zubair and Sa’ad and those were killed in early Islam like Hamza, ‘Ubaidah bin Harith and Mus’ab bin ‘Umair, and from Ansar Sa’ad bin Mu’adh, Simak bin Kharshah Abu Dujanah and others. Also Abubakar and ‘Umar do have good share in it even if they did not involve in it like these people which is because of their participation in a better Jihad in association with the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and to aid him during battles. And he sent them for war more than he sent ‘Ali. He sent Abubakar towards Bani Fazarah and elsewhere and he sent ‘Umar towards Bani Fulan. On the other hand, we do not know ‘Ali was sent for any battle except at some fort of Khaibar which he conquered. So Abubakar and ‘Umar were involved in the highest level of Jihad and besides that they have their share with ‘Ali in the lower category of Jihad.

What we aim to explain here is that Abubakar is the bravest among the companions; nobody is braver than he is after the Prophet. This is why when the Prophet (s.a.w) died, Muslims are overcome by the greatest tribulation, to the extent that intellects become weak, hearts become hollow, and they were greatly shaken; this one is denying his death, this one has become paralyzed, this one is taken by

surprise to the extent that he does not know what is going on around him or who is greeting him and those people are weeping. They have really fallen into a version of the Day of Resurrection, and as if they are in a Minor Day of Resurrection which is taken from the Major Day of Resurrection. At that time most of the rural areas have recanted and apostate from Islam. Abubakar stood up with a stable brave heart, unshaken and undeterred. He was blessed with certainty and patience. He informed them about the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) and that Allah has chosen him for what is with Him. He said to them: "Whoever worships Muhammad, he shall know that Muhammad has died and whoever worship Allah; surely Allah exist and He will never die."^[207]

Therefore, the needed bravery for a leader is not found in anybody after the Prophet (s.a.w) more perfectly than with Abubakar and then Umar. With regard to slaying infidels; certainly other than Ali among the companions have killed more infidels than the number killed by Ali. If the person who killed more infidels is the bravest, then many among the companions are braver than Ali. Barra'u bin Malik (the brother of Anas) has killed one hundred infidels through dual fighting, with the exception of those he participated in slaying. Nobody can be able to enumerate the number of infidels killed by Khalid bin Walid except Allah; nine swords are broken in his hand during the battle of Mua'tah and surely, he has killed manifold than those killed by Ali.

The Rafidi stated: "It is with his sword that the principles of Islam are established and the pillars of Islam erected."

We reply that this is a clear lie to whoever knew Islam. Nay, his sword is only a unit among many parts and a segment among the bases of establishing the principles of Islam. His sword does not have any role in many of the occurrences and events through which the principles of Islam are established. But on the day of the battle of Badr, his sword is among many swords with which Islam gained victory.

The Rafidi stated: "He is never defeated." We reply that: In this virtue he is like Abubakar, Umar, Talha, Zubair and many others among the companions. The statement that he is never defeated is like saying

that those men are never defeated. None of those men is known to be defeated (or to fled from the battlefield), even though something may occur in the heart, but it is not transmitted. It is also possible that something has occurred to Ali, but it has not been transmitted.

Muslims were defeated twice: In the battle of Uhud and in the battle of Hunain (which is a temporary setback) and it is not transmitted that one of those is defeated (or he fled from the war front). Nay, what has been reported in the books of wars and history is that Abubakar and Umar remained firm and steadfast with the Prophet (s.a.w) in the battles of Uhud and Hunain and they never turn back with those who fled. Whoever narrated that they fled on the day of Hunain is a liar. The person who fled on the day of Uhud is Uthman and Allah has forgiven him (and all others that fled).^[208] What was narrated that Abubakar and Umar fled with the flag on the day of Hunain is among the lies that have been fabricated by liars and slanderers.

The Rafidi stated: "He never hit with his sword except that he cut up (the target)." We reply that: This is a claim that nobody can be able to confirm or deny and there isn't any sound narration that can be relied on (to support it or deny it). If somebody made similar claim concerning Khalid bin Walid, or Zubair or Barra'u bin Malik, or Abu Dujanah or Abu Talha etc., that he never hit without cutting the target down, such a statement is similar to the one made in favor of Ali. Nay, the certainty of such a statement regarding Khalid bin Walid and Barra'u bin Malik is foremost. Certainly, the Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning Khalid: **"Khalid is one of the swords of Allah which He has unsheathed against the polytheists."** And in another hadith that has been narrated Anas: **The Prophet had informed the people of the martyrdom of Zaid, Ja'far and Ibn Rawaha before the news of their death reached. The Prophet said, "Zaid took the flag (as the commander of the army) and was martyred, then Ja'far took it and was martyred, and then Ibn Rawaha took it and was martyred." At that time the Prophet's eyes were shedding tears. He added, "Then the flag was taken by a Sword amongst the Swords of Allah (i.e. Khalid) and Allah made them**

(i.e. the Muslims) victorious" (Bukharri). Therefore, if such a statement has been reported concerning a person who Allah has made one of His swords: That he never hit with his sword without cutting down the target; such a statement will be closer to the truth, in addition to what is known that he has killed uncountable infidels in wars and he continued to be victorious.

The Rafidi stated: "In many instances, he used to remove anxiety and worry from the Prophet (s.a.w)." We reply that: This is a lie. It is of the stories that are narrated by the road side, for it is never known that Ali has ever removed worry and anxiety from the Prophet (s.a.w). Nay, this act is never known to be performed by Abubakar and Umar and they participated in Jihad more than him. Nay, the prophet (s.a.w) used to remove worry and anxiety from them. Abubakar has defended the Prophet (s.a.w) when the polytheists in Makka decided to beat him and kill him and Abubakar faced them saying: "Do you kill a man because he said: My Lord is Allah?" And they attacked Abubakar and beat him up. Ali is never known to do an act similar to this one. It has never occurred that the polytheists have encircled the Prophet (s.a.w) and he was rescued by Abubakar or Ali with the sword. This has not been narrated by any scholar and thus, it is untruth and a myth. With regard to what the Rafidi mentioned concerning Ali when he slept on the bed of the Prophet (s.a.w) on the night of his immigration to Madina. We have already explained that, that does not constitute any danger to Ali (for the polytheists are not after him).

SEGMENT: FALSIFYING CLAIMS OF THE RAFIDI ON FEATS OF ALI ON THE DAY OF BADR

The Rafidi stated: During the battle of Badr and it is the first battle that occurred at the begging of the first eighteen months after he arrived at Madina. His age at that time is twenty seven years. He killed thirty infidels alone and that is greater than the number of those who have been slayed. He also participated in slaying the rest.”

We reply that: This is a clear fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars that are learned in history and warfare. Nobody among the reliable scholars has mentioned it. This is among the fabrications of ignorant liars. The utmost that has been mentioned by (historians such as) Ibn Hisham, and before him Musa bin Uqbah and al-Umawi, is that he killed thirteen polytheists and they differed on six, whether he killed them or other people kill them. He also participated in slaying three men. This is the total number of those killed by Ali as was mentioned by those reliable historians.

SEGMENT: FALSITY AND IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI ON THE EVENTS OF THE BATTLE OF UHUD

The Rafidi stated: “During the battle of Uhud, when all people have fled from the Prophet (s.a.w) except Ali bin Abi Talib. Few men returned to the Prophet (s.a.w). The first among them is Athim bin Thabit, Abu Dujanah and Sahal bin Hanif. Uthman come to the Prophet (s.a.w) after three days and the Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: ‘You have gone in to it too broad. The Angels are surprised by the performance of Ali.’ Angel Gabriel announced while ascending to Heavens: ‘No sword except Zulfiqar and no brave youth except Ali.’ He killed most of the polytheists in this war and victory was attained by his efforts.

Qais bin Sa’ad said: ‘I heard Ali saying: ‘On the day of Uhud sixteen striking were inflicted upon me and I fell to the ground due to four of it. A man with handsome face and fine locks and good scent come to me, pick me up, and said: ‘Face them and fight them in obedience to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), for they are pleased with you.’ I went to the Prophet (s.a.w) and informed him. He said to me: ‘O Ali! Didn’t you know the man? I replied: No, but he resembled Dihya al-Kalbi.’ He replied: ‘O Ali! Allah has gladdened your eyes. That was Angel Gabriel.’”

We reply that: He has mentioned in these claims great lies that can only be spread and accepted among the ignorant, who have no knowledge of Islam, as if he telling these myths and superstitions to people who have no knowledge of history and warfare.

The Rafidi stated: “Ali killed most of the polytheists in this war and victory was attained by his efforts.”

We reply that: The biggest damage lies can causes is hinged upon ignorance. Is there any victory in this battle? Nay, the Muslims defeated the polytheist in the beginning. The Prophet (s.a.w) has already stationed some archers to guard a weak point (an opening between mountains) and he commanded them not to come down whether they are victorious or defeated. When the polytheists are being defeated, some of them shouted: “O people! Let us go after

booty.” Their leader Abdullah bin Jubair forbids them from leaving their stations, but they refused to listen to him. The enemies returned to them from their back and the leader of the polytheist at that time is Khalid bin Walid. He returned to them from their back and Satan shouted: “Muhammad has been killed.”

On that day, about seventy Muslims were martyred and nobody remained in the battle field with the Prophet (s.a.w) except twelve men, among them is Abu Ubaidah and Umar. Abu Sufyan ascended a high place and said, “Is Muhammad present amongst the people?” It was a great day of trial, tribulation, sieving, and differentiation. The enemy left them victorious, to the extent that they intended to come back and finish the Muslim and this made the Prophet (s.a.w) to go after them.

On that day Ali, Abubakar and Umar are not among those who defended the Prophet (s.a.w) for they are in the middle of the battle field, busy fighting the enemies. The Prophet’s teeth had been broken, his forehead had been slashed, his lips had been wounded, and blood was streaming down his face. Ali did not receive any wound on that day. [\[209\]](#)

The Rafidi stated, Ali said: “On the day of Uhud sixteen striking were inflicted upon me and I fell to the ground due to four of it.” We reply that: This is a lie against Ali and this narration cannot be found in any known book of hadith. Where is its chain of authority? Who assess it and find out that it is sound among the scholars of hadith? In which reliable book of hadith is it mentioned? Nay, those who have been wounded during the battle of Uhud are the Prophet of Allah (s.a.w) and many among his companions. Ibn Ishaq stated: “When the prophet (s.a.w) reached the outskirts of the battle field Ali brought to him some water from a spring which he carried in his shield. The Prophet (s.a.w) was about to drink it but he found it smelling, so he hated it and did not drink from it, but he washed the blood from his face and pour water on his face saying: ***“The anger of Allah is great upon the person who caused blood to flow from the face of his Prophet.”*** [\[210\]](#)

The Rafidi stated: "Uthman come after three days..." We reply: This is another lie.

The Rafidi stated: "Angel Gabriel announced while ascending to the Heavens; "No Sword except Zulfiqar and no brave youth except Ali." We reply that: This is a lie by the consensus of scholars. Certainly, Zulfiqar has never been the sword of Ali, it was a sword belonging to Abu Jahal and Muslims acquired it as war booty in the battle of Badr. Ahmad, Tirmidhi and Ibn Majah narrated on the authority of Ibn Abbas who said: ***"The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.) acquired his sword Zulfiqar day of Badr, and it is the one concerning which he saw a dream on the day of Uhud. He said: "I saw that my sword Zulfiqar was blunted and I interpreted that as some loss that would affect you. And I saw myself with a ram riding behind me and I interpreted that ... ; and I saw myself wearing a strong coat of chain-mail and I interpreted that as Madina. And I saw cattle being slaughtered, and by Allah what good cattle they are, by Allah what good cattle they are." What the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said came to pass."***

The lies made concerning Zulfiqar is like the lies made by ignorant men in which they stated that Ali has a sword which is elastic and it can extend when he hit with it for so and so distance. This is known by scholars as a myth or something that has never occurred; neither the sword of Ali, nor the sword of anyone else. If his sword can extend for days journey he will have fought Mu'awiyah with it.

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE LIES AND IGNORANCE OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING BATTLE OF THE COFEDERATES

The Rafidi stated: "During the battle of the confederates, which is also called the war of the ditch. After the Prophet (s.a.w) has finished digging the ditch, Quraish army under the leadership of Abu Sufyan and Kinanah and the people of Tihama, in an army of ten thousand men. Gafan also come with its supporters from Najd. They encircled the Muslims from the top and below as Allah the Most High said: **'When they came upon you from above you and from below you, and when the eyes grew wild and the hearts reached to the throats, and you were harboring doubts about Allah' (33:10).** The Prophet (s.a.w) went out with three thousand Muslims fighters and the ditch is the dividing line between them. The polytheists agreed with the Jews on fighting Muslims and they hope by their great number to defeat the Muslims. 'Amr bin Abdu-wad and Ikrimah bin Abi Jahal rode their horses and crossed the ditch through a narrow part to the side of the Muslims and they sought for dual fighting. Ali stood accepting the challenge, but the Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: 'He is 'Amr!' So Ali kept quiet. He sought for the dual fight for the second time and the third time and always Ali will stand up accepting the challenge, but the Prophet (s.a.w) will say to him: 'He is 'Amr!' He allowed him to fight him after the fourth challenge. 'Amr said to Ali: 'Go back son of my brother, for I do not want to kill you.' Ali said to him: 'You promised Allah that no man among the Quraish will invite you to one of two things but that you will accept one from him. I am hereby inviting you to Islam.' 'Amr said: 'I do not need that!' Ali said: 'Then, I am inviting you to fight me in a dual.' He said: 'I do not want to kill you.' Ali said: 'Nay, but I want to kill you.' 'Amr become angry and come down from his horse, they fought and Ali killed him. Ikrimah run away and the rest of the polytheists run away with the Jews. It is concerning this episode that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: 'Ali slaying of 'Amr bin Abdu-wad is better than the acts of worship of mankind and Jinns.'"

The answer to the above claim is: Firstly: Where is the chain of authority of this narration and an explanation to its soundness?

Secondly: The Rafidi mentioned many lies concerning this battle. One of the lies is where he stated that: Quraish, Kinan and people of Tihama are ten thousand men (excluding other groups of the confederates). The reality is that all the confederates, in addition to the above mentioned and including people of Najd – Tamim, Asad and Gafan – and the Jews have had about ten thousand men. The confederates are three groups: Quraish and their allies; who are the people of Makka and its environs, people of Najd; Tamim, Asad and Gafan and those who entered into their alliance and the Jews of Banu Quraizah.

The Rafidi stated: ‘Amr bin Abdu-wad and Ikrimah bin Abi Jahal rode their horses and crossed from a narrow part of the ditch... When ‘Amr was killed, the polytheists and the Jews fled (run away from the battle field).’

We reply that: All these are reckless lies, because the polytheists and the Jews continued their siege of the Muslim around the ditch until their alliance was destroyed by Nu’aim bin Mas’ud and Allah the Most High sent against them intense wind and Angels from Heavens. Allah the Most Exalted said concerning this issue: **“O you who believe! Remember Allah's Favor to you, when there came against you hosts, and We sent against them a wind and forces that you saw not [i.e. troops of angels during the battle of Al-Ahzab (the Confederates)]. And Allah is Ever AllSeer of what you do. When they came upon you from above you and from below you, and when the eyes grew wild and the hearts reached to the throats, and you were harboring doubts about Allah. There, the believers were tried and shaken with a mighty shaking. And when the hypocrites and those in whose hearts is a disease (of doubts) said: "Allah and His Messenger (SAW) promised us nothing but delusions!" (33:9-12). Allah the Most High also said: “And Allah drove back those who disbelieved in their rage, they gained no advantage (booty, etc.). Allah sufficed for the believers in the fighting (by sending against the**

disbelievers a severe wind and troops of angels). And Allah is Ever AllStrong, AllMighty” (33:25). This explained that the believers did not fight in this battle and that the polytheists are not defeated through any fight. This is the sure concurrent knowledge with the scholars of hadith, exegesis of the Qur'an, battles and wars, history and biographies. Therefore, how can anybody claim that dual fight between Ali and 'Amr bin Abdu-wud and the latter subsequent slaying made the confederates to flee away from the battle field?

The hadith that the Rafidi mentioned that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: “Slaying of 'Amr bin Abdu-wud by Ali is better than acts of worship of mankind and Jinns,” is a fabricated lie and that is why nobody among the Muslims scholars narrated it any reliable book. Nay, this hadith does not have any chain of authority, neither a sound nor a weak one. It is a lie and therefore, it is not permissible to ascribe it to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Certainly, it is not permissible to state that slaying an infidel is better than the acts of worship of all the humankind and Jinns.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI MADE FALSE CLAIMS ON THE BATTLE OF BANU NADHIR

The Rafidi stated: “In the battle of Banu Nadhir Ali killed the man who broke the tooth of the Prophet (s.a.w) and he killed additional ten men. This feat made the rest of the enemies to run away defeated.”

The answer to the above claim is: What he is narrating about this battle and other battles must have their chains of authorities mentioned, otherwise if a man wants to prove a basket of vegetables through a narration and nobody knows its chain of authority; it cannot be accepted. Then, how about proving an issue on principle of religion?

Secondly: this is a clear lie, for Banu Nadir are the people upon who Chapter Fifty Nine of the Qur'an (al-Hashr) was revealed by the consensus of scholars. They are among the Jews and the issue with them occurred before the battles of the ditch (confederates) and Uhud. Fighting, killing or wounding any person did not occur in it and nobody hit the teeth of the Prophet (s.a.w) in that battle. Tooth of the prophet (s.a.w) was broken in the battle of Uhud.

During the battle of Banu Nadhir, the Muslims lay a great siege against them and cut down their date trees, but nobody is killed or wounded either from among the Muslim or from among the Jews of Banu Nadhir.^[211]

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING WHAT HE CALL THE BATTLE OF SILSILAH

The Rafidi stated: “During the battle of Silsilah a Bedouin Arab come and informed the prophet (s.a.w) that a group of Arabs planned to attack him in Madina. The prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘Who will carry my flag? Abubakar said it is his own and he was given the flag; seven hundred men accompanied him. When he reached them, they said to him; ‘Go back to your companion for we are a greater number of men. He went back. The same thing happened in the second day when the flag was given to Umar. On the third day the Prophet (s.a.w) called Ali and gave him the flag. Ali went to them after the morning prayer and he slayed six or seven of them and the rest run away defeated. Allah swore with this act of Ali when He said: **‘By the (steeds) that run, with panting (breath)’ (100:1).**

We reply that: The most ignorant man will say to you: Explain to us the chain of narrators of this story, so that we can establish its soundness. The learned scholar will say to you: This battle – and all what has been mentioned in it – is a lie that is being narrated as a myth on roads side by some story tellers. It is similar to such lies that are being narrated about the story of Antar and Battal even though the story of Antar is very short. Battal too has a short story and it is what has happened to him during the Umayyad Caliphate while in wars against the Romans. But liars (and story tellers) elongated it to the extent that it is today written in volumes. Some story tellers such as Ahmad Dunaf and Zaibiq al-Misri started writing fabricated stories concerning Caliphs Rashid and Ja’afar. This battle is similar to those fabricated, created stories. It is not known or mentioned in any book of wars and battles or history. The scholars of these sciences never mention it and there are many of them such as Musa bin Uqbah, Urwah bin Zubair, al-Zuhri, Ibn Ishaq and his teachers, al-Waqidi, Yahya bin Sa’id al-Umawi’ Walid bin Muslim, Muhammad bin ‘A’iz etc., it is also not narrated in any hadith or mentioned in the Qur’an.

Summarily, all the battles of the Prophet (s.a.w) – and especially battles where fighting occurred – are popular and well known, they are written, documented and concurrently transmitted by scholars of history and they are mentioned in the books of hadith, jurisprudence, wars, history and biographies etc., for they are among the things that people eagerly and passionately want to record and transmit. It is not possible customarily and by law that the Prophet (s.a.w) shall have a battle in which these type of things are mentioned without being transmitted by any scholar of these sciences, in similar manner it is not possible to say that he (the Prophet) has decreed more than five daily prayers or he decreed fasting in more than one month within a year without such decrees being transmitted by scholars and in the like manner that it is impossible for the Prophet (s.a.w) to fight the Persians or go to Yemen and nobody reported it. These are the similitudes of this battle. Intelligence and the law will not accept that such a battle has occurred and nobody transmitted it.

SEGMENT: LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE BATTLE OF BANU MUSTALIQ

The Rafidi stated: “And he (Ali) killed Malik and his son and took many captives. Among the captives is Juwairiyya bint Harith bin Abi Dirar and the Prophet (s.a.w) selected her. Her father come that day and said: ‘O Messenger of Allah! My daughter is an honorable woman and she cannot be taken as captive.’ The Prophet (s.a.w) asked him to ask her what she want (giving her choice). He said to the Prophet (s.a.w): ‘You have done well and good.’ Then he said to his daughter: ‘O my daughter! Do not disgrace your people.’ She replied: ‘I chose Allah and His Messenger.’

We reply that: It is necessary to explain the chain of authority of what is brought forward or advanced as a proof, whether it is a hadith or a battle or to at least ascribe it to a reliable book. If that is not done; how can we know that the episode has occurred? Whoever knows history of the Prophet (s.a.w) will say: All these are lies among the fabricated myths of Shia Rafidah. Certainly, nobody has transmitted that Ali has done what is mentioned in the battle of Banu Mastaliq and he never capture Juwairiyya bint Harith.

In a sound hadith the story of Banu Mustaliq comes as follows: Ibn 'Aun reported: ***I wrote to Nafi' inquiring from him whether it was necessary to extend (to the disbelievers) an invitation to accept (Islam) before m". ing them in fight. He wrote (in reply) to me that it was necessary in the early days of Islam. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) made a raid upon Banu Mustaliq while they were unaware and their cattle were having a drink at the water. He killed those who fought and imprisoned others. On that very day, he captured Juwairiya bint al-Harith. Nafi' said that this tradition was related to him by Abdullah b. Umar who (himself) was among the raiding troops” (Muslim).***

The story of Juwariyyah is related as follows: ***Narrated Aisha, Ummul Mu'minin: Juwayriyyah, daughter of al-Harith ibn al-Mustaliq, fell to the lot of Thabit ibn Qays ibn Shammās, or to her cousin. She entered into an agreement to purchase her***

freedom. She was a very beautiful woman, most attractive to the eye.

Aisha said: She then came to the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) asking him for the purchase of her freedom. When she was standing at the door, I looked at her with disapproval. I realised that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) would look at her in the same way that I had looked. She said: Apostle of Allah, I am Juwayriyyah, daughter of al-Harith, and something has happened to me, which is not hidden from you. I have fallen to the lot of Thabit ibn Qays ibn Shammās, and I have entered into an agreement to purchase of my freedom. I have come to you to seek assistance for the purchase of my freedom.

The Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) said: Are you inclined to that which is better? She asked: What is that, Apostle of Allah? He replied: I shall pay the price of your freedom on your behalf, and I shall marry you. She said: I shall do this. She (Aisha) said: The people then heard that the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) had married Juwayriyyah. They released the captives in their possession and set them free, and said: They are the relatives of the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) by marriage. We did not see any woman greater than Juwayriyyah who brought blessings to her people. One hundred families of Banu Mustaliq were set free on account of her” (Abu Dawud).

Therefore, her father never comes to Madina and he never gives her option of staying or going back with him.

SEGMENT: LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE STORIES OF CONQUEST OF KHAIBAR AND MAKKA

The Rafidi stated: “during the battle of Khaibar the conquest of that town was in the hand of Ali. The flag was given to Abubakar and he was defeated, then it was given to Umar and he was defeated. Then the flag was given to Ali while his eyes are sick. The Prophet spit on his eyes and he became healthy. He advanced towards the enemy and killed Marhab (leader of the Jews) and the rest of them fled. They closed the door of their town but Ali removed it by force and made it a bridge over the ditch. The door is very heavy to the extent that it can only be closed by twenty men. The Prophet (s.a.w) said concerning Ali: ‘He did not remove the door with the power of five hundred men, but with the power of Allah.’ The conquest of Makka was through him (Ali).

We reply as follows: After stating: May the curse of Allah be upon the liars. We ask: Who mention this story among the scholars of hadith (or history etc.)? Where is its chain of authority and an explanation of its soundness? This is a very clear lie for all of Khaibar was not conquered in one day, because it a settlement built in the form of dispersed castles. Some of it was conquered by force, while some of it surrendered through peaceful negotiations. After that they breached the conditions of peace between them and the Prophet (s.a.w) and thus they became combatants.

Abubakar and Umar have not been defeated during the battle of Khaibar. It was narrated that Ali removed the door, but the claims that the door used to be closed by twenty men and that he converted it into a bridge, are baseless lies.

The Rafidi stated: “Makka was conquered through him.” We reply that: This is a lie, for absolutely Ali has no role in the conquest of Makka, except similar role that has been played by all those who witnessed its conquest. Many well known hadiths transmitted that Ali planned to kill two in-laws of his sister, Umm Hani, but she gave them sanctuary and the Prophet (s.a.w) accepted the sanctuary she

gave to them. Ali also decided to marry the daughter of Abu Jahal to the extent that the Prophet (s.a.w) got angry and he abandons the decision.

*** The successive, concurrent hadiths on the conquest of Makka clearly explained that Ali's role in its conquest is like that of the other companions. In one of those hadiths: ***"...Abu Huraira said: We were with the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on the day of the Conquest of Mecca. He appointed Khalid b. Walid as commander of the right flank, Zubair as commander of the left flank, and Abu 'Ubaida as commander of the foot-soldiers (who were to advance) to the interior of the valley. He (then) said: Abu Huraira, call the Ansar to me. So I called out to them and they came hurriedly. He said: O ye Assembly of the Ansaar, do you see the ruffians of the Quraish? They said: Yes. He said: See, when you meet them tomorrow, wipe them out. He hinted at this with his hand, placing his right hand on his left and said: You will meet us at as-Safa'. (Abu Huraira continued): Whoever was seen by them that day was put to death. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) ascended the mount of as-Safa'. The Ansar also came there and surrounded the mount. Then came Abu Sufyan and said: Messenger of Allah, the Quraish have perished. No member of the Quraish tribe will survive this day. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: Who enters the house of Abu Sufyan will be safe, who lays down arms will be safe, who locks his door will be safe. (some of) the Ansar said: (After all) the man has been swayed by tenderness towards his family and love for his city. At this, Divine inspiration descended upon the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him). He said: You were saying that the man has been swayed by tenderness towards his family and love for his city. Do you know what my name is? I am Muhammad, the bondman of God and His Messenger. (He repeated this thrice.) I left my native place for the take of Allah and joined you. So I will live with you and die with you. Now the Ansar said: By God, we said (that) only out of our greed for Allah and His Messenger.***

He said: Allah and His Apostle testify to you and accept your apology” (Muslim).

SEGMENT: LIES OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE BATTLE OF HUNAIN

The Rafidi stated: “During the battle of Hunain, the Prophet (s.a.w) advanced with ten thousand Muslims. Abubakar boasted out of pride: ‘We can never be defeated today due to our large number,’ and they were defeated. Nobody remained with the Prophet (s.a.w) except eight men of Banu Hashim and ‘Aiman bin Umm ‘Aiman. Ali was striking before him with his sword; he killed forty souls of the polytheists and they were defeated.

We reply that: After requesting for the soundness of the narration to be proven, we say:

With regard to what the Rafidi stated: “Abubakar boasted out of pride.” We reply that: This is a fabricated lie and before us are books of hadiths, history, biographies, wars and battles and exegesis of the Qur’an and nobody has mentioned in them that Abubakar boasted out of pride. The statement that has been transmitted is: “We can never be defeated today due to small number,” was made by some Muslims.

The Rafidi stated: “Nobody remained with him except eight men from Banu Hashim...” This is a lie. Nay Ibn Ishaq reported that, those who remained firm and steadfast with him are a number of Muhajirun and Ansar, and some members of his household. Among those who remained steadfast with him are: Abubakar, Umar. Ali, Abbas, Abu Sufyan and Rabi’ah the children of Harith and Usama and Aiman.

The statement of the Rafidi: “Ali is striking before him with his sword and he killed forty of the polytheists.” We reply that: All these are lies by the consensus of scholars of hadith, history, biographies, wars and battles.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ALI HAS KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNSEEN WHICH PROVE HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: “The fifth evidence: His giving information about the unseen and what will happen before it occurs. He informed about Talha and Zubair, when they sought his permission to go for lesser pilgrimage, saying: ‘No by Allah, you are not intending lesser pilgrimage, but you are intending to go to Basra.’ It happened as he has foretold. He informed while he is sitting in Dhi-Qar taking vows of allegiance that: ‘There will come to you from Kufa exactly one thousand men who will give their vows of allegiance for fighting until death.’ It occurred as he has mentioned and their last man was Uwais al-Qarni. He informed them about the slaying of Dhi-thadiyyah and it come to pass. Somebody informed him that the Kharijites will cross (river) Nahrawan and he said: ‘They will never cross it.’ Another person told him the same thing and he repeated his statement saying: ‘By Allah! They will all be killed.’ He informed Shahraban that a cursed person will cut his hands and legs and then hang him on a cross; and Mu’awiyah did that to him. He informed Mitham bin Tammar that he will be hanged on a cross before the door of the house of ‘Amr bin Harith and that he will be the tenth among those to be hanged on a short pole and he showed to him the palm tree upon which he will be hanged. It happened as he said. He informed Rushaid al-Hajari that his hands, legs and tongues will be cut and then he will be hanged on a cross. It occurred as he has said. He informed Kumail bin Ziyad that Hajjaj will kill him and that Qanbar will be slaughtered by Hajjaj and they all occurred as he has stated.

He informed Barra’u bin ‘Azib that my son will be killed and you will not aid him. It happened as he said. He informed about the Caliphate of Banu Abbas and that the Mongols will take over power from them. He said: ‘The administration of Banu Abbas is ease without difficulty. Even if the Mongols, the Dulaims, the Indians, the Berbers and the Tilisans form an alliance in order to remove them from power, they

cannot be able to remove them, until their clients and the chiefs of their state rebelled against them. That is when they will be overcome by a Mongol King who will advance towards them from the place where their power and authority began. He will not come to a city except that he conquered it and no flag will be raised against him except that he defeats it. Woe upon anybody who challenged him. The matter will continue like that, until he hand over his victory to a man from my progeny, who will spread the truth and act with justice.

Certainly, the matter happened as he has informed, for Hulagu appeared from the direction of Khorasan and it is from that place that the authority of Banu Abbas stated when Abu Muslim al-Khorasani gave them the vow of allegiance.”

We reply that: With regard to informing about some of what will happen before it occurred, we all knew that people who are lesser than Ali can make such predictions and it come to pass according to their statement. Therefore, Ali is greater than that. Among the subjects of Abubakar, Umar and Uthman there are men who can inform about what will happen in the future and they are not among those who are suitable to become leaders and they are not the best people in their time. This type of people exist at our present time and in other periods. Huzaifa bin Yamani and Abu Huraira and other men among the companions used to inform people with greater number of what will happen. Abu Huraira used to ascribe it to the Prophet (s.a.w), while Huzaifa sometimes ascribe it to the Prophet (s.a.w) and sometime he does not ascribe it to him, although it is considered as emanating from him. What Ali and other people inform might be of what they have learned from the Prophet (s.a.w) or what Allah has shown him of insight. Umar has informed about similar issues.

Books that have been written on miracle of the friend of Allah and their stories, such as the book of “Zuhd” by Imam Ahmad and the books “Hilyatul ‘Awliya,” by Isfahani, “Sifawatus Safwah,” by Ibn Jauzi and “Karamat al-‘Awliya,” by Abu Muhammad al-Khalil, and similar books by Ibn Abu Dunya and Lallika’i, which contained some acts of miracle by followers (and subjects) of Abubakar, and Umar such as ‘Ala bin Khadrami, a governor of Abubakar and Abu Muslim

al-Khawlani and their followers and Abu Sahb'a, Amir bin Abdu Qais etc., and other people who Ali is greater than them. Therefore, these do not show that he is the best or better than anybody among the companions, let alone being better than the other Caliphs.

The Rafidi did not mention any chain of authority for the stories he has narrated and ascribed them to Ali. The soundness of some of it is known, some of it is known to be fabricated lies and some of it is ambiguous; is it true or false? The story that he mentioned about the King of the Mongols is a lie against Ali, for he did not handed over his victories to a man of his progeny. This story was fabricated by latter Shia Rafidah (in order to aid Hulagu and make the Shia not to fight him or resist him).

The claim of Shia extremists that Ali has perfect knowledge of the unseen is absolutely a lie. Having knowledge of some of what is hidden is not his exclusive trait and nobody possess absolute knowledge of the unseen; neither Ali, nor anyone else.

*** What will explain and prove to you that Ali do not know the unseen is that during his Caliphate and wars, he used to think about (the goodness or benefits of) some things and the opposite of what he think will occur. If he knew that after fighting and killing people, the desired objective of fighting will not be attained; he will not fight. Certainly, if he has not fought, he will be more honored and more victorious. If he knew that the two arbiters will deliver the verdict that they gave, he will not have endorsed their arbitration. Where is his knowledge of the unseen, about what will occur after that? Where is his removal of distress from the face of the Prophet (s.a.w) with his sword? Here he is with his army of ninety thousand men, unable to defeat Mu'awiyah! Nay, Shia Rafidah claims for him something and its opposite: They became extreme in him to the extent of saying that he is infallible, that he does not forget and that he knew the unseen. They are not satisfied with what Allah has bestowed upon him of bravery, until they describe him with superpower abilities and strength that are not acceptable by human intellect as fabricated by fabricators. In the contrast they speak about his inability to confront Abubakar, although he has no money and has few partisans

(members of his clan). This then is the absolute contradiction. Allah said: **“And if they intend to deceive you, then verily, Allah is All-Sufficient for you. He it is Who has supported you with His Help and with the believers. And He has united their (i.e. believers’) hearts. If you had spent all that is in the earth, you could not have united their hearts, but Allah has united them. Certainly He is All-Mighty, All-Wise” (8:62-63).** Thus, Allah aided him with all the believers: Ali and other people.

What will explain to you that he do not know the unseen is that he used to say during the battle of Siffin: “O Hassan! Your father never think that the matter will reach this stage. May Allah bless the stand of Sa’ad bin Malik and Abdullah bin Umar. Certainly, if (their stands – which is none participation in the civil war) this is an act of obedience (to Allah), its recompense is great and if it is a sin, its danger is little.” It come in concurrent narrations that he used to complain about the disobedience of his subjects and companions. The real situation proved that the opinion of his son, Hasan about abandoning fighting is the best and more beneficial to the Muslim community. Men such as Sa’id, Ibn Umar, Muhammad bin Maslamah, Zaid bin Thabit and ‘Amran bin Hisain etc. refused to participate in the civil war. There were guided by some texts of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) concerning this stand. The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“There will be Fitnah (tribulations) during which one who sitting is better than one who is standing, and one who standing is better than one who is walking, and one who is walking is better than one who is running. He who exposes himself to them will be drawn to them and whoever find a refuge from them, let him seek protection therein” (Bukhari, Muslim).***[\[212\]](#)

Allah the Most High said: **“... But (you met) that Allah might accomplish a matter already ordained (in His Knowledge)...” (8:42).** This although Ali never excommunicated all those who fought him from Islam; even the Kharijites who ascribed him to unbelief. He did not take their families as war captives, he used to pray for Allah’s forgiveness and acceptance for Talha and Zubair.[\[213\]](#) He used to

pray against Mu'awiyah and 'Amr without excommunicating them from Islam.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE PRAYERS OF ALI ARE ACCEPTED BY ALLAH AND THIS PROVES HIS LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: "The sixth evidence: Ali's supplications are accepted by Allah. He prayed to Allah to take away the intellect of Busr bin 'Artah and he became deranged. He prayed to Allah to blind the sight of 'A'iz and he became blind. He prayed to Allah to turn Anas into a leper and he was afflicted with leprosy and that was when he refused to testify on an issue. He also prayed to Allah to blind Zaid bin Arqam and he becomes blind."

We reply that: This trait exists among many companions of the Prophet (s.a.w) in a greater measure than is found with Ali. After the Prophet's companions there are people with this traits and this trait will continue to exist as per as there is a believer existing in this world. The supplications of Sa'ad bin Abi Waqqas never miss its target. The Messenger (peace be upon him) prayed for him saying: ***"O Allah, make his invocations answered, make his arrow hit rightly, and make him beloved to Your Servants" (Hakim).***

It was reported that when `Umar bin Al Khattab appointed Sa'd an Emir (governor) to Kufa in Iraq, some people rebelled against him and complained about him to `Umar. So, `Umar sent Muhammad ibn Maslamah to investigate the allegations and report back to him. When Muhammad arrived at Kufa, he asked the tribes and the people about him. All the people praised him until he entered the masjid of Banu `Abs. One of the people whose name was Abu Sa'dah stood up and said: As for Sa'd, he does not judge justly between us and does not participate in Jihad. And he never distributed (the war booty) equally and never did justice in legal verdicts." (On hearing it) Sa'd said, ***"I pray to Allah for three things: O Allah! If this slave of yours is a liar and got up for showing off, give him a long life, increase his poverty and put him to trials." (And so it happened). Later on when that person was asked how he was, he used to reply that he was an old man in trial as the result of Sa'd's curse. 'Abdul Malik, the sub***

narrator, said that he had seen him afterwards and his eyebrows were over-hanging his eyes owing to old age and he used to tease and assault the small girls in the way” (Bukhari).

*** Bar’a bin Malik used to swear for Allah and He will fulfill his vow. It comes in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Certainly, among the slaves of Allah, there are those who if they swear, Allah will fulfill their vows. Bar’a bin Malik is one of them” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** He fought one hundred dual fights. In another sound hadith, Narrated Haritha bin Wahb Al-Khuzai: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Shall I inform you about the people of Paradise? They comprise every obscure unimportant humble person, and if he takes Allah's Oath that he will do that thing, Allah will fulfill his oath (by doing that). Shall I inform you about the people of the Fire? They comprise every cruel, violent, proud and conceited person.”*** Anas bin Malik said, ***“Any of the female slaves of Medina could take hold of the hand of Allah's Apostle and take him wherever she wished” (Bukhari).*** In another hadith, Narrated Anas: ***That his aunt, Ar-Rubai' broke an incisor tooth of a girl. My aunt's family requested the girl's relatives for forgiveness but they refused; then they proposed a compensation, but they refused. Then they went to Allah's Apostle and refused everything except Al-Qisas (i.e. equality in punishment). So Allah's Apostle passed the judgment of Al-Qisas (i.e. equality of punishment). Anas bin Al-Nadr said, "O Allah's Apostle! Will the incisor tooth of Ar-Rubai be broken? No, by Him Who sent you with the Truth, her incisor tooth will not be broken." Allah's Apostle said, "O Anas! The prescribed law of Allah is equality in punishment (i.e. Al-Qisas.)" Thereupon those people became satisfied and forgave her. Then Allah's Apostle said, "Among Allah's Worshippers there are some who, if they took Allah's Oath (for something), Allah fulfill their oaths” (Bukhari).*** ‘Ala bin Hadrami is the governor of the Prophet (s.a.w) and Abubakar over Bahrain and it is well known that his prayers are accepted (by Allah).

What he (the Rafidi) has narrated concerning Ali is not attached to any chain of authority; therefore, it can only be accepted after its soundness is proven. Furthermore, some of those stories are clear fabricated lies, such as the prayer of Ali against Anas for leprosy and the prayer against Zaid bin 'Arqam for blindness.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ADVANCED ANOTHER MIRACLE OF ALI AS PROOF TO HIS LEADERSHI

The Rafidi stated: "On his way a terrible thirst came on his followers. The water with them had been used up. They began to search for water to right and left but they did not find any trace of it. He turned off the main road with them and went a little way. A hermitage appeared before them in the middle of the desert. He went with them towards it. When he reached its courtyard, he ordered those (with him) to call for its occupant to come before them. They called him and he came. He asked him: "Is this residence of yours near water, which will quench the thirst of these people?" "There is more than six miles between me and water," he answered. "There is no water nearer than that to me. If it was not for the fact that I am brought enough water for each month to sustain me, I would be destroyed by thirst." "Did you hear what the monk said?" he asked. "Yes," they answered. "Order us to go to the place which he indicated. Perhaps we will reach water while we still have strength." "There is no need for you to do that," he told them. He turned the neck of his mule in the direction of the qibla (i.e. towards Mecca) and he directed them to a place near the hermitage. "Uncover the ground in this place," he ordered them. A group of them went straight to the place and uncovered it with iron shovels. A great shiny rock appeared. They said: "Commander of the faithful, here is a great rock on which the shovels are useless." "This rock is over water," he told them. "If it moves from its position, you will find the water." They struggled to remove it. All the people gathered together and tried to move it but they could find no way to do that. It was too difficult for them. When he saw that they had gathered together and striven to remove the rock but it was too difficult for them, he put his leg over his saddle until it reached the ground. Then he rolled up his sleeves. He put his fingers under the side of the rock and he moved it. He removed it with his hand and pushed it many yards away. When it had moved from its position, the white (glitter) of water appeared before them. They hurried to it and drank from it. It was the sweetest, coldest and

purest water that they had ever drunk from on their journey. "Get supplies and quench your thirst," he told them. They did that. Then he went to the rock and took it with his hand and put it back where it had been. He ordered that its traces be removed with earth. The hermit had been watching from on top of his hermitage. When he realized what had happened, he called out: "People, help me down, help me down." They helped him to get down. He stood in front of him and said: "This hermitage was built in memory of the person who will find this rock and bring water from it, a number of monks have passed before me without finding it. Man, are you a Prophet sent (by Allah)?" "No," he replied. "(Then are you) an angel who is close to Allah?" he asked. "No," was the answer. "Then who are you?" asked (the hermit). "I am the testamentary trustee of the Apostle of Allah, Muhammad bin Abdullah, the seal of the Prophets (s.a.w)," he replied. "Stretch out your hand," said the hermit, "so that I may submit to Allah, the Blessed and Exalted, at your hands." The Commander of the faithful (r.a), stretched out his hand and told him: "Make the two-fold testimony." He said: "I testify that there is no god but God alone without any partner. I testify that Muhammad is His servant and His Apostle. I testify that you are the testamentary trustee of the Apostle of God, the one with most right among the people to authority after him." The monk is among those who are martyred fighting on the side of Ali. Sayyid al-Humairi has arranged this story into a poetry."

We reply that: This is similar to other lies that ignorant men think that are of the virtues of Ali, while the reality contradicts that assumption. The person who fabricated these myths is ignorant of the virtues of Ali and what he deserved of commendations and praises. The only exploit or feat in this story is that he indicated to a rock and they found under it water and that he remove the rock.

This type of virtue or miracle has been performed by many people who are lesser than Ali. Nay, even among those who love Abubakar and Umar there are some men who performs better than this type of miracle. If this type of feat happens at the hand of good people; it is

blessing and grace from Allah, although this type of exploit can happen at the hand of people who are profligate.

The Rafidi stated: "This hermitage was built in memory of the person who will find this rock and bring water from it." We reply that: This kind of issue is nothing in the religion of Islam. In the Christian religion, they build their place of worship in dedication to their scholars past and present, but in Islam house of worship; the mosque is built for Allah, for the mention of His Name alone.

The Rafidi stated: "Ali said: I am the testamentary trustee (legatee) of the Apostle of God." We reply that: This is a lie against Ali and he never makes such claim; neither during the Caliphate of the three Caliphs, nor during the battles of Siffin.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ALI FOUGHT WITH JINNS AND SLAYED THEM

The Rafidi stated: "What has been narrated by Ahlus Sunnah, that when he set out against the Banu al Mustaliq, he avoided the road. Night came and he stopped near a rugged valley. Towards the end of the night, Gabriel came down to tell him that a group of unbelieving Jinn had gone into the valley with intention of plotting against him and causing harm to his companions. He called for Ali and told him: 'Go to this valley, those of the jinn who are enemies of Allah, who want (to attack) you, will come against you. Repel them with the strength, which Allah has given you. You will be protected by the names of Allah that he has specially endowed you with knowledge of it. Ali went down to them and slayed them."

We reply that: Ali's status is greater than this one, for surely those who are lesser than him can also destroy the Jinns, but this is a fabricated lied hadith against the Messenger of Allah and against Ali by the consensus of scholars of hadith and its sciences. Nothing of this has taken place during the battle of Banu Mustaliq. *** These are lies that cannot be propagated among us. Yes! You can propagate them amongst your brothers, the Rafidah. Ali is greater in status for the Jinns to confront him (or face him). A Shia, Rafidah youth asked Abu Baqa' Khalid bin Yusuf an-Nabilisi about Ali's fighting Jinns and he replied: "O you Shia adherents! Do not you possess intellect? Who is better to you; Umar or Ali!" He replied: "Certainly, Ali." He said to him: "If the Prophet (s.a.w) said to Umar; ***'Never mind, son of Khattab. I swear by Him in whose hand my soul is that Satan has never met you walking on a mountain-road without turning to another one than yours'*** (Bukhari). If Satan is fleeing away from Umar, how can he fight Ali?"

The Rafidi stated: "It was narrated by Ahlus Sunnah." We reply that: If he means that it has been narrated with a reliable chain of authority or in a book which a mere mention of hadith in it is acceptable or a scholar of hadith whose opinion on hadith is reliable and acceptable has verified and declared it as sound; then, that is

not true. If he means that all the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah have narrated it; then, this is a lie. If he means that a person has narrated it, whose narration is not a proof (in itself); then, this is not beneficial.

SEGMENT: RETURN OF THE SUN FOR ALI

The Rafidi stated: “The ninth evidence: Reappearance of the sun twice, the first time during the period of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the second time after him. The first one was narrated by Jabir bin 'Abdullah al-Ansari, Abu Sa'id al-Khudri that: one day, the Prophet (s.a.w) sent Ali for a job and when he returned, it was the time for 'Asr prayer. The Prophet (s.a.w) was not aware that Ali had not prayed his 'Asr prayer, so he rested while his head was on Imam 'Ali's leg. At the same time, revelation was sent down to the Prophet (s.a.w) and it continued until near the sunset. When the Prophet (s.a.w) finished receiving the revelation, He asked Ali whether or not he had prayed his 'Asr prayer. “Since your blessed head was on my leg and you were resting, I couldn't wake you up.” Ali responded. The Prophet (s.a.w) asked Allah to return the sun so that Ali can pray his 'Asr prayer. In that moment, the sun came back to the extent that it was the proper time for 'Asr prayer and Ali performed his 'Asr pray.”

“The second time a similar event has happened during the rule of Ali. In this account, on their way to Babylon, he and his army reached (river) Euphrates; he and some of the army crossed the river and prayed their 'Asr prayer on the other side, while a group of the army who were trying to get their horses across the river, couldn't pray 'Asr prayer in its time. Ali asked Allah to return the sun, the sun returned and so that they could pray their 'Asr prayer.” Al-Humairi wrote a poem concerning that event.”

We reply that: The virtues of Ali, his being a friend of Allah and his high status with His Lord is well known – by the grace of Allah – through reliable sources that necessitated certain, sure, knowledge that does require lies, and stories which soundness is unknown. The hadith of returning the sun for him has been mentioned by a number of scholars such as Tahawi, Qadi Iyyad etc., and they counted that among the miracles of the Prophet (s.a.w). But the investigative scholars of hadith who are specialist in this science have assessed and evaluated it and found it a fabricated lie and that is why Ibn

Jawzi placed it among the fabricated narrations in his book “al-Maudu’at.” Abul Farj stated: “This is certainly a fabricated hadith and those who narrated it are shaky and confused.”

The second episode in Babylon is certainly a fabricated lie and the mere arranging it in to a poem by al-Humairi do not make it sound for he is not there when the event took place and lies is an old practice. He just heard the story and arranged it into a poem and the extremist usually form poems of disparagements and praises with baseless stories. Al-Humairi is known to be among the extremist.

Whoever missed Asr prayer (or any prayer) due to negligence his sin will not be forgiven except if he sought for Allah’s forgiveness. And after he repented he doesn’t need the sun to be returned for him so that he prayed in its right time. Furthermore, this type of grand events and miracle are among the things that people love to talk about and transmit and when you find that it is just narrated by one or two people and that they are not reliable, you will realize that they are just telling lies.

*** If it is contended that it has been related in sound hadiths that the Sun was returned for some Prophets! We reply that: The Sun was not returned to him, but its setting was delayed and the day was blessed for him. The length of the day and night might be latent and we only knew its stoppage for Yusha’u bin Nun (a.s)^[214] by sound texts. If there is any sound text stating returning of the Sun for Ali, we will accept it. What we are contending is that how can such a great matter occur; that the Sun has set and then, it reappeared again and there is no concurrent hadiths transmitted concerning that, in the same manner that they transmitted breakage of the Moon into two parts and the Qur’an has spoken about it.

Furthermore, Yusha’u is in dire need for the day to be extended and prolonged for him, because he was forbidden to fight after the Sun has set, for Allah has forbidden upon him (and the Israelites) to work on Saturdays. This is in contrast to the Muslims community, for they do not need that. Certainly, whoever is not able to pray Asr in time; his sin cannot be forgiven, if he is negligent, except with repentance

and praying it and these suffices return of the Sun. And there is no blame on him for praying it after the Sun has set, if he is not negligent i.e. the person who is sleeping or the one who forgot to pray in time. Furthermore, the mere setting of the Sun has elapsed the fixed time for the Asr prayer, and whoever prayed after that, has not prayed at the fixed period, even if the Sun has reappeared and returned after it has set, for its mere setting will make the man who is fasting to break his fast and the Muslims to pray Magrib (after Sun set) prayer. This is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), when the time for Asr prayer passed and he did not pray it during the battle of the ditch, he prayed it together with his companions outside its time without asking Allah to return the Sun for him. He merely supplicated against those who diverted his attention from praying it in time and he was unhappy about its occurrence.

It could be that the Sun was covered by some clouds before it set and when the clouds passed away the Sun reappeared. May be they thought that the Sun has set and then the clouds passed away leaving it bare.

SEGMENT: THE MYTH OF KUFAN FLOOD

The stated: “The tenth evidence: What has been narrated by the historians that the river of Kufa over flooded and people feared to be submerged by its water. They went to Ali and complained to him about their fears. Ali rode the mule of the Prophet (s.a.w) and went to the river while people are following him. When he reached the bank of the river Euphrates, he came down and prayed two units of prayers, and supplicated to Allah. Then he hit the water with a stick in his hand and the water receded. The fishes at the bottom of the river appeared and greeted him except the eel and the scaleless fish, which kept silent. He was asked concerning that and he answered: ‘Allah has given those fishes that are clean and pure the ability to speak to me and He kept the impure ones silent, for they are away from His mercy.’”

The answer to the above is from many perspectives: Firstly: The main demand by asking: Where is the chain of authority of this story, which will prove its reality and soundness? Otherwise, a mere story that is ascribed to Ali without any chain of authority can be created by any person; but that will not prove anything.

Secondly: The mule of the Prophet (s.a.w) is not with Ali.

Thirdly: This story is not narrated in all reliable books and if this story is true they will have recorded it because it is among the things that people are motivated to enthusiastically and passionately transmit. The Rafidi did not mention its chain of authority. How can a mere story that has no chain of authority be accepted?

Thirdly: All types of fish are permitted to be eaten.^[215] It comes in sound hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w) that he said concerning the sea (river): ***“In the sea’s water is purity, and that which is dead in it is halal” (Malik, Abu Dawud).*** Allah has said in the Qur’an: ***“Lawful to you is (the pursuit of) watergame and its use for food - for the benefit of yourselves and those who travel...” (5:96).*** The predecessors of the Islamic community and all its grand scholars have had consensus that it is permissible to eat all types of fish and

Ali and all the Prophet's companions permitted eating of those types of fish. Then, how can they state that Allah has made it impure? The fact is that Shia Rafidah are ignorant men who are disallowing what Allah has permitted with this type of fabricated myth.

*** How can anybody say that Allah has made it impure? Can we forbid what Allah has allowed with this type of myth? Again, customarily fish cannot be able to speak except by some miracles. Therefore, Allah made the ones that spoke to speak by His Will and the ones that did not speak remained in their natural disposition – if it is true that this has happened! What is the sin committed by the fish? We have already stated that Ali has greater status and that he is above the like of these fabricated narrations.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI NARRATED THE MYTH OF ALI WITH A SNAKE

The Rafidi stated: “The eleventh evidence: A number of historians narrated that: “Once when Ali was on the pulpit a snake entered from one of the doors of the mosque. People wanted to kill it, but Ali asked them to leave it alone. They left it alone. The snake began to crawl to the pulpit. He stretched and saluted to Ali, Ali made a gesture to it to wait until the sermon is completed. When the sermon was completed, he spoke to the serpent and then come down. People asked him concerning it and he said: ‘This is the ruler of the Jinns, he has ambiguity concerning a story (some matter) and I explained it to him.’ The people of Kufa used to call the door through which the snake come in the “snake door,” but Banu Umayyah decided to make people forget that virtue and therefore they placed dead bodies of slayed men on it and allowed them to remain there for a long time and people changed its name to the “door of the slayed.”

We reply that: Undoubtedly those who are lesser than Ali with much degree are needed by Jinns (on some matters) and they come to them asking questions and seeking for religious verdicts on some issues. This is a well-known reality in the past and the present. Therefore, if this episode has occurred to Ali, his status is greater than it. If this story is a lie, it did not reduce the status of Ali in the least.

The person who is trying to prove the virtue of Ali with this type of story must be devoid of its knowledge. But whoever has seen people of goodness and religion, who have performed greater miracles than this one or the person who has seen in himself greater miracles than this one; he will realize that this is not among the things that can be used to prove the precedence of Ali, or that he is the best.

CHAPTER FOUR: ON LEADERSHIP OF THE TWELVE IMANS

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI ON THE LEADERSHIP OF THE TWELVE IMAMS

The Rafidi stated: "This is the fourth chapter and it deal with the leadership of the rest of the twelve Imams. We will prove it through a number of ways. Firstly, through texts: There is a concurrent report among the Shia of faraway regions, which they have inherited from their predecessors, from the Prophet (s.a.w) who said to Husain: 'This is a leader, son of a leader, brother of a leader and father of nine leaders. The ninth among them is the last, he is the arising one, his name is like my name and his nickname is like my nickname. He will fill the earth with fairness and justice as it was filled with injustice and aggression.'"

The answer to the above claim is from many perspectives: Firstly: This is a lie, because nobody is narrating this narration except one sect among the sects of Shia and the rest of the sects are rejecting it and saying that it is a fabricated lie.

The Shia Zaidiyyah have absolutely rejected it as a fabricated lie, and they are most rational, the most knowledgeable and the best among all Shia sects. All the sects of Shia Isma'iliyyah have rejected this narration and attributed it to fabricated lies. All Shia sects have rejected this narration as a fabricated lie, except the Shia Ithna Ashariyyah and they are only a sect among over seventy Shia sects. Summarily there are many Shia sects and they have more than twenty big sects, and all of them are rejecting this narration as a fabricated lie. Thus, where is the concurrency of this narration among the Shia?

Secondly: We say: This has been contradicted by the texts that are being narrated by other Shia sects, such as those who believe in the leadership of other than the twelve Imams. The Rawundites are also narrating other texts as proof to the leadership of the Abbasids. Certainly, each Shia sect is making its own claims with texts that contradicted the texts of Shia Ithna Ashariyyah.

Thirdly: We say: Nobody amongst the past Shia scholars narrate this hadith, no one among them has ever mention it in a book and nobody among them has ever used it to prove his point in a statement (or while delivering a sermon or in a debate). The history of those past scholars is concurrently known. Therefore, this is a fabrication of latter Shia scholars. This narration was fabricated after the death of Hasan al-Askari and they say: His son Muhammad is hidden. At this period this text appeared after the death of the Prophet (s.a.w) with two hundred and fifty years (250).

Fourthly: We say: Ahlus Sunnah and their scholars have outnumbered Shia many times and all of them knew that this is a fabricated lie against the Prophet (s.a.w), through certain, definite, sure knowledge, that is unmixed with any doubt. Ahlus Sunnah are inviting Shia to mutual imprecation (Mubahalah) on this issue. The claim of Shia scholars that their text is concurrent is not close (cannot be matched) to the claim of Ahlus Sunnah that is a fabricated lie.

Fifthly: We say: Among the free-conditions of establishment of a concurrent hadith is that the predecessors shall transmit it, the middle generation and the latter generations. It is well known that before the death of Hasan al-Askari, nobody is transmitting anything concerning the awaited Imam. It is also not known that anybody is talking about the leadership of the twelve Imams and the awaited Imam during the Caliphate of Ali and the period of the Umayyad kingdom, for at these periods some people are only claiming textual appointment of Ali or that of some people after him. These claims to textual appointments of the twelve leaders are not known to be advanced by anybody among the predecessors. Then, how can it be claimed that it is coming from them?

Sixthly: We say: certainly, Muslims scholars knew that the first time when Shia Imamiyyah started claiming textual appointment of leaders appeared during the last phase of the Caliphate of the rightly guided Caliphs. The claim was fabricated by Abdullah bin Saba and a group of liars. These people do not exist before that time; therefore, which concurrent narrations do they possess?

Seventhly: The hadiths that has been narrated on the authority of the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning the virtues of Abubakar, Umar, and Uthman are transmitted concurrently in greater measure than the transmission of this text. Therefore, if it is permissible to censure what the generality of the Prophet's companions have transmitted concerning those virtues, then censuring this one is foremost and more deserved. And if censuring this one is not permitted, then disallowing censuring what has been concurrently reported by those companions is foremost. Since the virtues of the Prophet's companions have been established by many concurrent texts, it is not conceivable that they agreed upon rejecting this text, for certainly contradicting it - if it is true and sound – is one of the greatest sins and aggression.

Eighthly: Certainly, nobody among the Shia Imamiyyah is transmitting this text with a complete, joined, uninterrupted chain of authority (to the Messenger of Allah), not to speak of with concurrent chains of authorities. These expressions requires repetitions and if those who are transmitting it did not learn it, they cannot memorize it. Where is the large number of people who have memorized these expressions, in the same manner that the expressions of the Qur'an, at-Tashahhud (Attahiyat), and the call to prayer are memorized generation after generation to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)?

Whenever we claimed concurrency of the virtues of the Prophet's companions, we sometimes do so with implied meaning; such as the concurrency of the Caliphate of the four Caliphs, the battles of Camel and Siffin, marriage of the Prophet (s.a.w) to Aisha and Ali with Fatima, and similar examples of things that do not require to be transmitted with any particular expression that need to be studied, such as the concurrency of what the companions have achieved, and their grand outstanding works and other traits. And sometimes we mean by concurrency in transmitting expressions by memorizing them by those who acquired their knowledge through narration.

Ninthly: Surely, what has been transmitted from members of the Prophet's household and his progeny has contradicted this narration. Certainly, they never claimed that they are Divinely appointed to be

leaders. Nay, they used to ascribe whoever makes such statement to lying and slander, not to speak of claiming that they are establishing the leadership of twelve leaders by texts!

SEGMENT: ON THE HADITH OF MAHDI

The Rafidi stated: “Narrated from Ibn Umar that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘At the end of time a man will appear from my progeny, his name will be like my name and his surname is like my surname, he will fill the earth with justice as it was filled with injustice.’ That is the Mahdi.”

We reply that: The hadiths that we (Ahlus Sunnah) used to establish the coming of Mahdi are sound. They have been narrated by Ahmad, Abu Dawud and Tirmidhi etc., from Ibn Mas’ud and other people. Example in the hadith narrated by Ibn Mas’ud, he said : ***The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: If only one day of this world remained. Allah would lengthen that day (according to the version of Za'idah), till He raised up in it a man who belongs to me or to my family whose father's name is the same as my father's, who will fill the earth with equity and justice as it has been filled with oppression and tyranny (according to the version of Fitr). Sufyan's version says: The world will not pass away before the Arabs are ruled by a man of my family whose name will be the same as mine” (Abu Dawud).***

Narrated Umm Salamah, Ummul Mu'minin: ***The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: The Mahdi will be of my family, of the descendants of Fatimah” (Abu Dawud). In the version of Abu Sa'id al-Khudri it is stated: “He will rule the world for seven years” (Abu DAwud).***

Narrated Ali ibn AbuTalib: ***Abulshaq told that Ali looked at his son al-Hasan and said: This son of mine is a sayyid (chief) as named by the Prophet (peace_be_upon_him), and from his loins will come forth a man who will be called by the name of your Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) and resemble him in conduct but not in appearance. He then mentioned the story about his filling the earth with justice” (Abu Dawud).***

Many groups have erred concerning these hadiths; some people rejected them and supports their opinion with the hadith of Ibn Majah where the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“There is no Mahdi except Jesus,***

the son of Mary” (Ibn Majah). This hadith is weak, but Muhammad bin Walid al-Bagdadi relied on it. It is not a reliable hadith, Ibn Majah narrated it from Yunus, Yunus from Shafi’i, and Shafi’i narrated it from a man among the people of Yemen called Muhammad bin Khalid al-Janadi and he is among the unreliable narrators. This hadith has not been recorded in Musnad of Shafi’i. Some people said: Shafi’i did not hear it from al-Janadi and that Yunus did not hear it from Shafi’i.

Secondly: The Shia Ithna Ashriyyah that are claiming that he is their Mahdi; but the name of their Mahdi is Muhammad bin Hasan and the one that has been described by the Prophet (s.a.w) is Muhammad bin Abdullah (and in a hadith above Ali said he is from the progeny of Hasan while their Mahdi is from the progeny of Husain).

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI ON THE NECESSITY OF THE EXISTENCE OF INFALLIBLE IMAM AT ALL PERIODS

The Rafidi stated: “Secondly, we have explained the necessity for the existence of infallible leader at all times and periods and nobody is infallible except those people by consensus.”

We reply to the above claims from many perspectives:

Firstly: We rejected the first premise as already explained.

Secondly: Many groups and sects have rejected the second premises (thus the claimed consensus is nullified).

Thirdly: This infallible leader (their twelfth Imam) that they started claiming in a particular period; since the time he was born (according to their claim) and up to today and for more than one thousand, one hundred and fifty years; he entered into an underground room – according to them in the year 260 A.H – as a child of five years and to some of them less than five years. Up to now, nothing has been achieved with him of grace or benefit that can be attained through a very weak leader or what can be attained from the action of individual leaders, judges, and scholars, not to speak about what an infallible leader can do. What is the benefit of this type of leader if he exists? Then what about if he is none existent?

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT VIRTUES OF THE TWELVE IMAMS PROVE THEIR LEADERSHIP

The Rafidi stated: Thirdly: “Each of those Imams have a lot virtues and outstanding traits that necessitate his becoming a leader.”

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: The utmost limit of those virtues and outstanding traits is that whoever possess them is suitable to be appointed as a leader, but he cannot be a leader just because he is suitable to lead, in the like manner that a person cannot be a judge just because he is suitable to be a judge.

Secondly: Suitability to become leaders are traits that are possessed by other people among the Quraish in the like manner that those people possesses them. Other people are also suitable to be appointed as leaders because there is nothing that necessitates making it exclusive rights of certain individuals; but they did not become leaders just because they are suitable.

Thirdly: The twelfth leader of the Shia Rafidah did not exist to any man of reason and intellect. Therefore, he cannot be a leader.

Fourthly: The Askariyain and those similar to them and those on their grade and status are not known to be men of religion and knowledge, in similar manner that Ali bin Husain, Abu Ja'afar and Ja'afar bin Muhammad are known to be men of religion and knowledge.

CHAPTER FIVE: ON THE LEADERSHIP OF THE FIRST THREE CALIPHS

SEGMENT: CRITICISMS OF THE RAFIDI ON LEADERSHIP OF THE FIRST THREE CALIPHS

The Rafidi stated: The fifth chapter: "Certainly, those who ruled before Ali bin Abi Talib are not leaders and that will be proven from many angles."

I (Ibn Taimiyyah) said: The answer is: Certainly, if he means by his statement that they have never become leaders of Muslims with power and authority in their hands, that Muslims did not give them vow of allegiance and that they do not possess power of executing punishments, discharging rights and obligations, fight the enemies of Islam, lead Muslims in daily prayers, Friday prayers and Eids (ceremonial) prayers, and (the power to) discharge other responsibilities that are encompassed in the meaning of leadership; then, that is lies and arrogance, for this an issue known concurrently and Shia Rafidah and other people knew it. If they have not become leaders, Shia Rafidah would not have been criticizing them.

Shia Rafidah expressly establishes leadership and negates same without differentiating. Do they mean establishing the same leadership and possessing power and authority (and discharging its responsibilities) or the same suitability and deserving to be leader. Whenever they talk about a leader they mean the second type, but they imagine that it encompass the two definitions.

If he means that they are not suitable to be leaders and that only Ali is suitable to be a leader among them or that he is more suitable than them; then this contention is a lie and it is an issue upon which people have differed.

We will give a general, brief reply to that contention and thereafter give a detailed reply. With regard to the general brief reply we say: We knew through absolute certain knowledge that they are leaders who are suitable for leadership. This is a matter upon which nobody differed among the sects that are ascribing themselves to Islam except Shia Rafidah. Nay, the Islamic community and its generality are saying: We certainly knew that they deserved more to be the

leaders. Nay, they are saying: We knew that they are the best people in the Islamic community. This is a decisive, absolutely certain, definite knowledge with us and it is impossible to be opposed by a decisive or a speculative proof. This is because decisive proofs do not contradict each other on their necessities and requisites. With regard to speculative proofs; it is because speculative proofs do not contradict decisive proofs.

Summary of that is: Whatever the criticizer can present cannot go beyond two things; either a narration whose soundness we do not know or we do not know its negation of their leadership. And any of the two premises whose soundness is not known, cannot be suitable in opposing what is known with absolute, certain, decisive knowledge. Since we have decisive, definite knowledge that established their leadership, it is not necessary for us to accept interruptive, divisionary ambiguity. In the same manner, that what we knew by absolutely certain, decisive knowledge do not necessitate upon us to accept what contradicted it of sophist ambiguities. Nobody can reject certain, decisive knowledge and accept speculation and wishful thinking. The matter is the same whether he is a speculator or an adversary; nay, if the falsity of the ambiguity become manifest to him, he shall explain it to other people and that will be to him an increment in knowledge and science and aiding the truth as an onlooker or a debater. If the ambiguity is not clear to him, he shall not reject certainty and embrace speculation. We will explain – by the Grace of Allah – many proofs of their suitability and deservedness to be the leaders and that they deserved to be the leaders more than anyone else.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED ABUBAKAR CLAIMING THAT HE POSSESSED A SATAN

The Rafidi stated: “Firstly: Abubakar said: ‘Certainly, I have a Satan that takes possession of me. Therefore, if I am on the right path aid me and if I derail from the right path corrects me.’ Among the responsibilities of a leader is to correct the subjects. Therefore, why shall he demand them to correct him?”

We reply to the above argument from many perspectives:

Firstly: What has been soundly reported from him is: ***“I have a Satan who takes possession of me; so when he comes to me,”*** he means when he is angry, ***“avoid me so that I may have no [evil] effect [even] on your hair and your skins. (The History of Al-Tabari).*** And he said: ***“...Then obey me as long as I obey Allah! But is I disobey Allah or His Prophet (s.a.w), you owe me no obedience” (Kanzul Ummal).*** What Abubakar has said is one of the greatest statements for which he is praised and commended, as we will explain, - by the will of Allah the Most High.

Secondly: The Satan that possesses a person is interpreted as the Satan that grip all human beings when they are angry and he fears to commit aggression against anybody when he is angry. It come in sound hadith: Abdurrahman bin Abu Bakra reported: ***“My father dictated (and I wrote for him) to Ubaidullah bin Abu Bakra while he was the judge of Sijistan: Do not judge between two persons when you are angry, for I have heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: ‘None of you should judge between two persons when he is angry’” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Thus, the Prophet (s.a.w) has forbidden judging between people when the judge is angry and this is what Abubakar intends: He intends not to judge while he is angry and he commanded them not to request judgment from him or to make him judge between them while he is angry. This is part of his obedience to Allah and His messenger (s.a.w).

Thirdly: It could be said: All human beings used to get angry to the extent that the master of the children of Adam (s.a.w) said: ***“O Allah, I make a covenant with Thee against which Thou wouldst never go. I am a human being and thus for a Muslim whom I give any harm or whom I scold or upon whom I invoke a curse or whom I beat, make this a source of blessing, purification and nearness to Thee on the Day of Resurrection” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

With regard to the statement of Abubakar: ***“If I am on the right path, you shall aid me and if I divert from the right path, correct me.”*** We say that: This is part of the perfection of his justice, fear of Allah and it is obligatory upon all leaders to copy him and follow his footsteps on this issue, and it is compulsory upon the subject to treat their leaders according to that advice. If the leader is right and on the right path, they shall aid him on it and if he goes astray or make mistake, they shall explain to him the right thing and show him the right conduct. If he intentionally wants to commit injustice, they shall prevent him from doing so, according to their ability. If he is a leader that love the truth and follow the truth like Abubakar, they do not have any plea or reason for not guiding him whenever he erred. If they cannot be able to prevent his injustice, except by a way that can bring greater corruption, then they shall not prevent small injustice with bigger injustice.

With regard to the statement of the Rafidi: “It is the responsibility of the leader to correct his subjects; then, why shall he request them to correct him?”

There are many answers to the above objection: Firstly: We do not accept that a leader can correct his subjects and they cannot correct him. Nay, the leader and his subjects shall aid each other on goodness and righteousness and not on sin and aggression. The supreme leader is like a commander of an army or leader of a caravan (travellers in the desert), or a leader of prayer or the pilgrimage; and the religion of Islam is known through the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Thus, a leader do not have a religion of his own; but it is necessary that he exert effort (Ijtihad) in order to deduce branches of religion (on occurrences and new events). If the truth is

clear to him he commanded it, if it is only the leader who understand the right thing; he shall explain it to his subjects and it is obligatory upon them to obey him. If the matter is doubtful to them; they shall consult each other until it become clear to them. If the leader did not understand the matter but one of his subjects understood it; he shall explain it to him. If they differed in their understanding of the truth of the matter; then, they shall follow the Ijtihad of the leader, because there must be preponderance and the opposite of that is rejected.

Secondly: The statement that Abubakar made increased his honor, status, estimation and commendation in the Islamic community and the Muslims never honor anybody after their Prophet (s.a.w) in the way they honor and respect him. The Islamic community never respect anybody in the manner it has respected him without being induced or compromised with worldly riches or because they fear him. Nay, those who gave the vow of allegiance to the Prophet (s.a.w) under the tree are the same people who gave him their vow of allegiance by their free will, as an acknowledgement of his excellence, superiority, and being the foremost person that deserved the Caliphate. Furthermore, we never knew that they differ in one religious issue during his time, but that the differences are removed by his explaining the issue to them in a clear perfect manner and they will all abandon their opinions and take hold of his own. He has no associate in this matter. Umar is closer to him on similar issues, followed by Uthman. With regard to Ali: He fought them and they fought him and thus, he did not correct them and they did not correct him. Therefore, who between the two leaders achieve the goal of leadership in greater measure? Who between the two leaders establish religion, defeated the apostates (and make them return to Islam), fought the unbelievers and the words (opinions) of the believers agreed upon him? Can anybody compare this with this other than the person who has reached an extreme limit in intellectual corruption and religious defects?

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED THE ALLEGIANCE GIVEN TO ABUBAKAR AS AN OVERSIGHT

The Rafidi stated: “Secondly: Umar said: ‘The vow of allegiance given to Abubakar is an oversight, but Allah has protected the Muslims from its evil consequences and whoever return to similar action shall be killed.’ Since it is an oversight, it did not take place on the correct opinion. He also supplicated to Allah to protect the Muslims from its evil and then he commanded the slaying of whoever repeats such action. All these necessitate disapproving the whole process.”

We reply that: The statement of Umar that come in sound hadith on the authority of Ibn Abbas, in a sermon that he has delivered stated partly: ***“(O people!) I have been informed that a speaker amongst you says, ‘By Allah, if ‘Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such-and-such person.’ One should not deceive oneself by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abubakar was given suddenly and it was successful. No doubt, it was like that, but Allah saved (the people) from its evil, and there is none among you who has the qualities of Abubakar. Remember that whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consulting the other Muslims, neither that person, nor the person to whom the pledge of allegiance was given, are to be supported, lest they both should be killed” (Bukhari).*** What Umar means is that the vow of allegiance was rushed immediately, without any preparation or planning because, Abubakar has been defined for leadership. Thus, it is not required that all people assembled for his selection because they knew that he deserved it more than anyone else as he has explained in the sentence: ***“and there is none among you who has the qualities of Abubakar...”*** There is nobody after Abubakar who people have agreed upon his superiority, suitability, and deservedness, in the same manner that they agreed upon him. Therefore, whoever wants to appoint any person as the Caliph

without consulting the rest of the Muslims shall be killed. Umar did not pray to Allah to protect the Muslims from its evil, but he informed that Allah has prevented the evil of its tribulation by the consensus that has been achieved on Abubakar.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED KNOWLEDGE OF THE CALIPHS

The Rafidi stated: “Thirdly: They are defective in knowledge and they refer to Ali in most of their rulings (and judgments).”

We reply that: This is one of the greatest lies and slanders. Absolutely, it is not known that Abubakar has benefitted (or acquire) any knowledge from Ali, but Ali has narrated hadiths from him and followed his footsteps and examples. Ali has benefitted more from the knowledge of Umar than Umar has benefitted from him. Uthman is lesser in knowledge than Abubakar and Umar, despite that he did not need the knowledge of Ali. Some people complained to Ali concerning some of those who are appointed by the governors Uthman to collect Zakat and Ali sent to him a book on Zakat, but Uthman rejected it saying: “We do not need it.”

Uthman is right because the methods of deriving Zakat, collecting it and knowing the minimum amount liable for its payment and distributing it are issues hinged upon instructions of the Prophet (s.a.w) concerning them. This knowledge comes to us from four sources. The most sound source and which is with the Muslim scholars today is the book of Zakat written by Abubakar to Anas bin Malik and this is the book that has been narrated by Bukhari.^[216] Most of the scholars (Imams) of Jurisprudence relied on the book of Abubakar on the issue of Zakat followed by the book of Umar which has been narrated in Sunan Abu Dawud.

With regard to the book of Zakat that was narrated on the authority of Ali: It contained many things that are not accepted by any scholar, such as: “The Zakat of twenty five sheep is one fifth,” because it has contradicted concurrent texts from the Prophet (s.a.w). Thus, what has been narrated from Ali either is abrogated or is a mistake in transmission. The fourth book is the book of ‘Amr bin Hazm, which the Prophet (s.a.w) wrote for him when he sent him to Najran. The book of Abubakar is the last book and it is the most accepted among them.

Therefore, how can any rational person say: They used to refer to him in most of their rulings, legal opinions, laws, and judgment, while his own judges do not use to refer to him. Nay, Shuraih al-Qadi and Ubaidal as-Salmani and other judges that exist during the time of Ali are passing judgment from what they learned from other than him!

SEGMENT: AN OVERVIEW OF THE CRITICISMS OF THE CALIPHS BY THE RAFIDI

The Rafidi stated: "Fourthly. Many occurrences have emanated from them and we have already explained most of them."

We reply that: We have also explained their falsity in brief and in details. Replying to allegations against them and what are objected against them is much easier than replying to the allegations and objections directed against Ali. And nobody that possess knowledge and fairness will disparage them and justify Ali. Nay, whenever Ali is purified and made blameless, they are foremost and more deserved to be justified and purified and if he disparage them; then disparaging Ali and finding his faults is foremost.

Whenever Shia Rafidah launched its attacks; the necessity of its censuring Ali is greater than censuring the three Caliphs and if it did not launch the attacks; its falsity and self contradictory nature is very clear; and that is the right thing to do

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI DISPARAGED THE CALIPHS FOR WORSHIPPING IDOLS BEFORE ISLAM.

The Rafidi stated: "Fifthly: The words of Allah the Most High: '**... My Covenant (Prophethood, etc.) includes not unjust people**' (2:124). Allah informed that His promise to made leaders do not encompass the unjust people and an unbeliever is an unjust person, as explained by another verse: '**...And it is the disbelievers who are the unjust**' (2:254). Certainly, the three Caliphs have been unbelievers worshipping idols up to the time when the Prophet (s.a.w) broadcasted his message."

We reply to the above contention of the Rafidi from many perspectives:

Firstly: It will be said: The unbelief that is followed by correct belief has absolved the person from all blames. This is what is known necessarily in the religion of Islam. Nay, in the religion of all the Prophets. Allah the Most High has said: "**Say to those who have disbelieved, if they cease (from disbelief) their past will be forgiven. But if they return (thereto), then the examples of those (punished) before them have already preceded (as a warning)**" (8:38). And the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said in a sound it was narrated that *'Amr ibn al-'Aas (may Allaah be pleased with him) said: When Allah put Islam in my heart, I came to the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) and said: "Give me your right hand so that I may swear allegiance to you." He held out his hand and I withdrew my hand. He said, "What is the matter, O 'Amr?" I said, "I want to stipulate a condition." He said, "What do you want to stipulate?" I said, "That I will be forgiven." He said, "Do you not know that Islam destroys that which came before it?" (Muslim).* In another version the Prophet (s.a.w) said: *"Islam destroys whatever is before it, certainly, immigration destroys whatever is before it, and surely, the pilgrimage destroys whatever is before it" (Mustadrak).*

Secondly: Certainly, not everybody who is born a Muslim (in Islam) is better than the person who embraced Islam by himself (his choice). Nay, it comes in many hadiths of the Prophet (s.a.w), that he said: ***“The best periods is the period in which I am sent, and then the one that come after it and then the one that come after it.”*** In another hadith Allah's Apostle said, ***“You see that the people are of different natures. Those who were the best in the pre-Islamic period, are also the best in Islam if they comprehend religious knowledge. You see that the best amongst the people in this respect (i.e. ambition of ruling) are those who hate it most. And you see that the worst among people is the double faced (person) who appears to these with one face and to the others with another face (i.e. a hypocrite)” (Bukhari).*** Abu Huraira narrated directly from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) that he said: ***“People are like mines of gold and silver; those who were excellent in Jahiliya (during the days of ignorance) are excellent In Islam, when they have, an understanding...” (Muslim).*** All of those men embraced Islam by their free choice, abandoning unbelief (after they have been unbelievers), and they are better than the second century, those who are born in Islam. On this issue the Shia Rafidah have abandoned the Book of Allah, the Sunnah of His Prophet (s.a.w), the consensus of the predecessors and rational evidences. They take hold on this issue opinions that are known to be false, such as their claim that ‘Azar (the father of Abraham), parents of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his grandparents and his uncle Abu Talib are believers.

Thirdly: Before Allah sent Muhammad as His Prophet, there is no believer among the Quraish: No man, no woman, no child, no the three Caliphs and no Ali. If it said concerning adults; they have been worshipping idols, the same thing can be said about children; Ali and other children (among the Quraish).

Fourthly: Whoever say that a Muslim is an unbeliever after embracing Islam, he has become an unbeliever, by the consensus of Muslims. Thus, how can it be said that the best of Allah's creation

(after the Prophets): That they are unbelievers due to the advanced
(Shia Rafidah arguments and false pretentions).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CENSURED ABUBAKAR BECAUSE HE HAS REQUESTED TO BE RELIEVED FROM THE CALIPHATE

The Rafidi stated: “The sixth: Abubakar said: ‘Relieve me of this responsibility for I am not the best among you.’ If he is a leader it is prohibited upon him to ask to be relieved.”

We reply that: Firstly: It is incumbent upon him to explain to us the soundness of this narration, otherwise not every narration is sound and disparaging a person with unreliable, unsound narration is not a sound action.

Secondly: If this narration is sound from Abubakar, it is not right to criticize it with his statement: “It is prohibited for him to ask to be relieved (from the responsibility),” for this is just a claim without any proof to back it up. Why is it prohibited for him to seek for resignation or to be relieved, if he has made the request? Nay, if he has said that; we do not have any consensus to the contrary and we do not have any text prohibiting it. Therefore, there is no need for prohibiting it as a matter of finality and if he did not say it prohibiting this statement does no harm.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT ABUBAKAR REGRETTED CONCERNING THE STATUS OF THE ANSAR BEFORE HIS DEATH

The Rafidi stated: “The seventh: The statement of Abubakar before his death: ‘I wish I have asked the Prophet (s.a.w) if the Ansar has any right concerning this affair (leadership)!’ This proved that he is doubtful of the soundness of the vow of allegiance given to him, although he is the person who rejected the opinion of the Ansar on the day of Saqifa when they said: ‘A leader from us and a leader from you,’ with what he narrated that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘Leaders are from Quraish.’”

We reply that: The statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) that: “Leaders are from the Quraish,” is sound and true. Whoever said that Abubakar is doubtful of this reality or he doubt the soundness of his leadership is a liar. Whoever said that Abubakar says: “I wish I have asked the Prophet (s.a.w) whether the Ansar has right to become leaders has certainly told a reckless lie! This issue is very clear to him and the rest of the companions as per certainty due to many texts regarding it from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). This alone showed clearly that the above narration is false (lies and fabrications).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CLAIMED THAT ABUBAKAR HARMED ALI AND ZUBAIR AND RAIDED THE HOUSE OF FATIMA

The Rafidi stated: “The eighth: Abubakar said while terminally ill: ‘I wish I have left the house of Fatima unsearched and I wish while we are in the shade of Banu Sa’adah that I gave my vow of allegiance to one of the men, so that he become the leader and I become his adviser.’ This showed that he has attacked the house of Fatima while Ali, Zubair, and other people are holding a meeting.”

We reply that: Censure or disparagement is not acceptable until the statement is confirmed with sound chain of authority and it shows clearly a blameworthy action. If one of these conditions is not fulfilled the censure is negated. Then, how about if both conditions are unfulfilled? We are absolutely certain that he never move or intend to harm Ali or Zubair in any way. Nay, he never move to harm Sa’ad bin Ubadah, the person who refused to give vow of allegiance to him right from the beginning up to the end.

The utmost limit of what some people say is that he searched the house to see if there is anything belonging to the state treasury which shall be distributed and given to those who deserved them. He letter on saw that, if he has left those properties with them, it is permissible, for they deserved to be given what is acquired of war booties. [\[217\]](#)

Certainly, Abubakar has never attempted harming them, by the consensus of men of religion and knowledge. The ignorant liars transmit this kind of story, and it is believed by the fools of the world, who are saying: “The companions have demolished the house of Fatima, hit her stomach and cause her to abort her pregnancy.” All these are false claims and lies of slanderers by the consensus of scholars and they are only accepted and broadcasted by those who are of the species of animals.

The Rafidi stated: “He said, I wish I have given my vow of allegiance to one of the two men...”

We reply that: The Rafidi did not mention it's chain of authority and he did not explain its soundness. If he had made such a statement, then it shows his asceticism and fear of Allah the Most High.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE CALIPHS ARE PART OF THE ARMY OF USAMA

The Rafidi stated: “The ninth: The Prophet (s.a.w) said: ‘Prepare the army of Usama,’ he repeatedly commanded the dispatch of that army. Among those who are in the army are Abubakar, Umar and Uthman, but he did not include Ali in it. This is because he wanted to prevent them from taking over the Caliphate after him. But they refused to comply with his command.”

Answer to the above claim is from many perspectives:

Firstly: We demand for the soundness of this narration. Certainly, this hadith has not been narrated with a known chain of authority or a sound one and nobody among the scholars of hadith has stated that it is sound. It is well known that advancing arguments with narrations is not right except after establishing the proof of its soundness, otherwise everybody can say what he like to say (and it became religion).

Secondly: This is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith. Abubakar and Uthman have never been part of the army of Usama, but it was reported that Umar is part of that army. It come concurrently that he has appointed Abubakar to succeed him in leading prayer (during his terminal illness) up to the time he died. Abubakar prayed with them in the morning he died. He opened the curtain of the room and viewed the Muslims lined in rank behind Abubakar and he was happy with that. In sound hadith Anas bin Malik reported, ***“Abubakar led them in prayer due to the illness of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) of which he died. It was a Monday and they stood in rows for prayer. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) drew aside the curtain of (A'isha's) apartment and looked at us while he was standing, and his (Prophet's) face was (as bright) as the paper of the Holy Book. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) felt happy and smiled. And we were confounded with joy while in prayer due to the arrival (among our midst) of the***

Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him), Abubakar stepped back upon his heels to say prayer in a row perceiving that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) had come out for prayer. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) with the help of his hand signed to them to complete their prayer. The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) went back (to his apartment) and drew the curtain. He (the narrator) said: The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) breathed his last on that very day” (Muslim). In a version of the hadith is narrated by Az-Zuhn: Anas bin Malik Al-Ansari, told me, “Abubakar used to lead the people in prayer during the fatal illness of the Prophet till it was Monday. When the people aligned (in rows) for the prayer the Prophet lifted the curtain of his house and started looking at us and was standing at that time. His face was (glittering) like a page of the Qur’an and he smiled cheerfully. We were about to be put to trial for the pleasure of seeing the Prophet, Abubakar retreated to join the row as he thought that the Prophet would lead the prayer. The Prophet beckoned us to complete the prayer and he let the curtain fall. On the same day he died” (Bukhari).

Therefore, with all these hadiths, how is it possible to say that he has commanded him to go to a military operation under the leadership of Usama?

Thirdly: If the Prophet (s.a.w) want to appoint Ali, those people are too weak to prevent the command or wish of the Prophet (s.a.w) and the generality of the Muslims will be most obedient to Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w), than allowing those people to disobey his command. If you consider the fact that more than one third of the Muslims have fought beside Ali against Mu’awiyah and they knew that he does not possess any text supporting his Caliphate, you will realize that, if he has a text, the generality of the Muslims would have fought in his support. [\[218\]](#)

Fourthly: He commanded Abubakar to lead people in prayer and if Ali is the appointed Caliph and his successor, he would have commanded him to lead the Muslims in prayer. How can that be

while the Prophet (s.a.w) has never appointed Ali over Abubakar?

SEGMENT: NULLIFYIN CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT THE PROPHET NEVER GIVES ABUBAKAR AN APPONTMENT

The Rafidi stated: “The tenth: He (the Prophet) never appoint Abubakar (to lead any affair) and he appointed others over him.”

We reply that: This is false. Nay, the appointments he gave to Abubakar are exclusive to him, such as leading the pilgrims to perform the pilgrimage (leading prayers while he is sick and Zakat collection etc.). He has also appointed him for other issues and responsibilities.

Secondly: That the Prophet (s.a.w) has appointed people who are below the status of Abubakar – by the consensus of both Ahlus Sunnah and Shia - to carry out some responsibilities such as ‘Amr bin ‘As, Walid bin ‘Uqbah and Khalid bin Walid. Therefore, it is known that he did not abandon giving him appointment because he is less than those men (if we assume that he is never appointed).

Thirdly: Certainly, lack of appointing him did not show that he is defective. Nay, he can abandon appointing him because if he remain with him, he will be more beneficial to him than the responsibility given (away from him) and because his need is for him (close to him in Madina) is greater than that appointment (as a governor or Zakat collector). Certainly, Abubakar and Umar are like Ministers and Chief Advisers to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI HAS LIED WHEN HE CLAIMED THAT THE PROPHET HAS REMOVED ABUBAKAR FROM LEADERSHIP OF THE PILGRIMS

The Rafidi stated: "The eleventh: The Prophet sent Abubakar to deliver the Chapter ninth of the Qur'an, then he sent Ali for the same mission and commanded Ali to ask Abubakar to return to Madina. The person who is unsuitable to deliver a chapter of the Qur'an or some part of it, is not suitable to be the leader of the community whose responsibilities included delivering laws to the whole community."

Answer to the above is from many perspectives: Firstly: This is a lie by the consensus of scholars and general concurrent reports. Certainly, the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed Abubakar to lead people for the pilgrimage in the ninth year after immigration to Madina and he never recalled him and he never returned to Madina (until after the pilgrimage). Nay, he is the person who led people in all the rituals and acts of worship of the pilgrimage and Ali is among his subjects; he prays behind him, prevent what he prevents and carry out his commands and directives like all those with him. This is a concurrent matter in which two people do not differ; that Abubakar is the person who led pilgrimage that year with the command of the Prophet (s.a.w). Then, how can anybody say that he asked him to return? Certainly, he sent Ali after him in order to repudiate the agreement that is between the Prophet (s.a.w) and the polytheists of Makka. For in accordance to their custom nobody can sign an agreement (which is hinged upon peace and war) or repudiates it except the leader by himself or a man from his household; they do not accept the validity of these matters from anyone else.

Undoubtedly, this Rafidi and his scholars are among the most ignorant men with the condition of the Prophet (s.a.w), his history, his affairs and his events. Furthermore, they are ignorant of what is concurrently known by any person that has minimum knowledge of history of the Prophet (s.a.w). They will also come to an event that has occurred and they will make additions into it and make

reductions into it (according to their vain desires). This Rafidi does not do what we have mentioned, but his scholars and predecessors have committed it, and he is just aping them and following their footsteps, without evaluating what they have stated and referring it to what is with the scholars of concurrent sound, knowledge and what is known by both the special and the generality to be the truth.

Secondly: The Rafidi stated: "Responsibilities of leadership of the community included delivering laws to the whole community."

We reply that: This is a false statement, for the Islamic community has received all laws from its Prophet (s.a.w) and thus, it does not need a leader to convey it except in a similar manner that it requires scholars and teachers to teach it (and explain it to the people).

Thirdly: Every Muslim has conveyed the Qur'an from the Prophet (s.a.w) and therefore, the statement of the Rafidi: "Abubakar is not suitable to convey it," is precluded, banned and negated.

Fourthly: Nobody shall think that conveying the Qur'an is an exclusive responsibility of Ali. Certainly, the teaching of an individual cannot soundly convey the Qur'an. Nay, it must be transmitted concurrently (by a large number of people).

SEGMENT: REPLY TO THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT UMAR MADE MISTAKES IN DELIVERING JUDGMENTS

The Rafidi stated: “The twelfth perspective: Umar said, Muhammad did not die. This showed that he has little knowledge. He commanded that a pregnant woman shall be stoned to death and Ali prevented him. He said: ‘If not because of Ali, Umar will have been ruined.’ There are other laws in which he erred and was inconsistent in many of them.”

We reply that: It come in sound hadith that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: , ***“Amongst the people preceding you there used to be 'Muhaddithun' (i.e. persons who can guess things that come true later on, as if those persons have been inspired by a divine power), and if there are any such persons amongst my followers, it is 'Umar bin Al-Khattab” (Bukhari).*** In another hadith, Aisha said, the Prophet (s.a.w) used to say: ***“In the communities that passed before you, there used to be Muhaddithun, if there is any of them in my community it will be Umar” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** In a version in Bukhari the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“In the past among the Banu Isra’il there are men who speak without being prophets, so if they exist among my community, it is Umar.”***

In a sound hadith Ibn `Umar narrated that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“While I was asleep I saw a container brought with milk, I drank from it until I saw satiation flowing in my nails, and then I passed it to `Umar.’ They said, ‘How did you interpret it, Messenger of Allah?’ He said: ‘Knowledge’”*** In another sound hadith Abu Sa’id al-Khudri said: I heard the Prophet (s.a.w) saying, ***“While I was sleeping I saw people being shown to me and they had shirts on. Some of them reached to the breast, and some of them reached lower than that. `Umar was shown to me and he had on a shirt which he was dragging along.’ They said, ‘How did you interpret it, Messenger of Allah?’ He said, ‘The deen***

(religion)''' (Bukhari, Muslim). Therefore, Umar is the most knowledgeable companion after Abubakar.

With regard to Umar falling into doubt concerning the death of the Prophet (s.a.w); surely, that has occurred for a moment and it became clear to him that he has died. This type of condition can occur in many situations: A person might doubt the death of a dead man and then, it become clear to him that he is dead. Many things have occurred to Ali contrary to his belief, but that did not degrade his leadership. Nay, he made many legal rulings that are contrary to the situation and he died with those opinions i.e. his legal opinion on entrusted woman that died with nothing prescribed for her. There are many other cases that are known to the scholars.

If Umar did not know that the woman is pregnant, then this is a matter similar to the above mentioned case. He might have commanded her to be stoned without knowing that she is pregnant and Ali informed him that she is pregnant and that is why he said in appreciation; "If not because I have been informed by Ali, I would have stoned her and killed her fetus;" this is what Umar feared.

If a man of great, outstanding knowledge refers to a man of less knowledge in some issues that did not make him a man of lesser knowledge. Prophet Moses (a.s) has learned from Khidr three issues and Prophet Solomon (a.s) has learned from the bird Hoopoe information about Queen Bilqis.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICISED UMAR ON MAKING TARAWIH PRAYER CONGREGATIONAL

The Rafidi stated: “The thirteenth perspective: He (Umar) innovated congregational Tarawih prayer, although the Prophet (s.a.w) has said: ‘O you people! Certainly, night prayer in the month of Ramadan is supererogatory and doing it congregationally is an innovation. And the prayer of Dhuha (supererogatory prayer after Sun rise) is an innovation. Surely performing a little Sunnah is better than much innovation. Listen carefully, surely every innovation is a misguidance, and every misguidance is a path to Hell-Fire.’ Umar come out during Ramadan and saw lights in the mosque. He asked: ‘What is that?’ They said: ‘Some people have gathered for supererogatory prayer.’ He commented saying: Good innovation.”

We reply that: We have not seen or found among all the sects of innovation and misguidance a sect that is so reckless and bold in telling lies against the Prophet (s.a.w) than Shia Rafidah; they have attributed to him what he never say and they have gone to the extreme in telling lies against him. Some of them did not know the lies of their scholars and this is extremism in ignorance. A poet says it: “If you did not know, then that is a calamity. And if you know, then the calamity is greater.” We reply to the above from many perspectives:

Firstly: We make requests; what is the proof of the soundness of this hadith? Where is its chain of authority? In which book among the books of Muslims is it narrated? Who has said among the scholars that: This is a sound hadith; meaning who has affirmed it among the scholars of hadith?

Secondly: All those who have knowledge of hadith and its sciences knew out of necessity that this hadith is a fabricated lie against the Prophet (s.a.w). Nobody among the Muslims have narrated it in his book; it cannot be found in Sihah books or Masanid or Ma’ajim etc., and nobody know its chain of authority, neither a sound one nor a weak one. Nay, it is a clear lie.

Thirdly: It is established that people used to pray in the nights of Ramadan during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w) and it is established that he prayed congregational prayers for two or three nights with the Muslims during Ramadan. It come in sound hadiths on the authority of Aisha and other companions that: ***The Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) prayed one night in the mosque and people also prayed along with him. He then prayed on the following night and there were many persons. Then on the third or fourth night (many people) gathered there, but the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) did not come out to them (for leading the Tarawih prayer). When it was morning he said: I saw what you were doing, but I desisted to come to you (and lead the prayer) for I feared that this prayer might become obligatory for you. (He the narrator) said: It was the month of Ramadan” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

Umar called this prayer innovation because he did not arrange it before then and because whatever is done for the first time is linguistically called innovation and that is not innovation in religion. Certainly, innovation in religion is misguidance and that is what is done without any legal proof.

Fourthly: If this is a prohibited bad act Ali would have stopped it when he became the Caliph and he is in Kufa. Since he continued to practice it as practiced by Umar, it is proven that it is a recommended action. Nay, it is reported that Ali said: “May Allah lighten the grave of Umar as he has lighten for us our mosques.”

SEGMENT: REPLY TO THE CLAIM OF THE RAFIDI THAT MUSLIMS AGREED UPON SLAYING UTHMAN

The Rafidi stated: "The fourteenth perspective: Uthman has done many things that are prohibited to the extent that all Muslims objected against him and they agreed upon slaying him more that their agreement on appointing him the Caliph and the Caliphate of his two companions."

We reply to the above claim from many perspectives:

Firstly: This is one of the most apparent lies for all people have given vow of allegiance to Uthman; in Madina and all the regions and the countries of the Muslims. Two people did not disagree on his leadership and nobody refused to give him vow of allegiance, and this is why Imam Ahmad and some other scholars said: "It is more confirmed than the other Caliphates, for they all agreed upon him." But those who killed him are a small group (of rebels from other regions). Abdullah bin Zubair while censuring those who killed Uthman said: "They come to him like thieves from behind the city and Allah killed them a great slaying and some of them run away under the cover of the night."

Secondly: We say: those who disapproved Ali and fought him are greater in number than those who disapproved Uthman and killed him. Certainly, those who fought Ali, in comparison to those who killed Uthman are hundred-folds and a large number of his army rebelled against him and ascribed him to unbelief, saying before his face: "You have apostate from Islam and we will not return to obeying you, until you return to Islam."

Thirdly: It is known concurrently that all Muslims agreed upon giving vow of allegiance to Uthman and nobody refused to give him vow of allegiance. This, although Sa'ad bin Ubadah has refused to give vow of allegiance to Abubakar up to the time he died and he did not give vow of allegiance to Umar; he died during the Caliphate of Umar. Refusal of Sa'ad bin Ubadah to give vow of allegiance to Abubakar did not impair his Caliphate, because Sa'ad did not disparage Abubakar and he did not say he is not the best among the

Muhajirun; nay, this is a well-known fact among them, but he requested that there shall a leader from among the Ansar. It comes in sound hadiths that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“Leaders are from Quraish” (Bukhari, Muslim)***. Therefore, the opinion of Sa’ad is contrary to well-known, sound text and thus, his refusal to give vow of allegiance is a mistake by law and if a mistake is committed by law, it will not be needed in consensus.

With regard to giving vow of allegiance to Uthman; it is well-known that nobody stayed back from it; with the large number of Muslims and their wide spread all over the lands. With regard to Ali; since the moment he become the Caliph, those who refused to give him vow of allegiance are close to half of the Muslims from among the first and foremost to embrace Islam of the Muhajirun and Ansar and other people. There are those who stayed back, they did not fight on his side and they did not fight against him, such as Usama bin Zaid, Abdullah bin Umar and Muhammad bin Maslamah and there are those fought him. Furthermore, many among those who gave him vow of allegiance rebelled against him, ascribed him to unbelief, and allowed shedding of his blood. There are also those who abandon him and went to the side of Mu’awiyah, such as his brother ‘Aqil and those similar to him.

The Shia of Uthman (those who want avenge his murder) continued to disparage Ali and supports itself with those events, saying: “Ali is not among the righteous and rightly guided Caliphs,” and their arguments are stronger than the arguments of Shia Rafidah. Thus, since their arguments are false and invalid and that Ali was killed unjustly; then, Uthman is foremost regarding that (those who killed him are unjustified).

CHAPTER SIX: SHIA RAFIDAH CRITIQUE OF THE CALIPHATE OF ABUBAKAR

SEGMENT: REPLY TO THE RAFIDI ON NEGATING THE CALIPHATE OF ABUBAKAR

The Rafidi stated: "The sixth chapter is on nullifying their arguments and proofs on the Caliphate of Abubakar. They (Ahlus Sunnah) advance proofs from many ways. The first one is consensus. Our reply is that consensus is rejected and voided, for certainly a group from Banu Hashim did not accept his Caliphate and a group from among the grand companions, such as Salman, Miqdad, Abu Dhar, 'Ammar, Huzaifa, Sa'ad bin Ubadah, Zaid bin Arqam, Usama bin Zaid, Khalid bin Walid, Sa'ad bin 'As and Ibn Abbas. Even his father objected to his Caliphate, when he asked: 'Who succeed the Prophet (s.a.w)?' They replied him: 'Your son.' Then he said: 'What has the two weak men done (meaning Ali and Abbas)?' They replied him saying: 'They are busy preparing the Prophet (s.a.w) for burial and they saw that your son is the oldest among them.' He replied: 'I am older than him.' All the Banu Hanifa refused to take their Zakat to him and he call them apostates, fought them and took them as war captives. Umar objected to him that conduct and freed the war captives during his Caliphate."

We reply that: After thanking Allah, Who has exposed the true color of those Shia Rafidah, the brothers of apostates and for what He has established to both the special and the generality that they are truly brothers of the apostates by exposing their secrets and removing their veils with their tongues. Certainly, Allah will continue to expose what is in their hearts and reveal their enmity to Allah, His Messenger (s.a.w) and His chosen, pious friends. Whoever Allah want to put in to error (for his rejecting faith), you can do nothing for him against Allah in the least.

We further say: Whoever has a little knowledge of Islamic history and he heard this type of speech, will arrive at two definite conclusions; either the man who stated it is one of the most ignorant of the history of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his companions or is one of the most reckless, daring liars. My opinion is that this writer (the Rafidi) and those similar to him among the scholars of Rafidah, are

copying from the books of their predecessors without critical evaluation of those reports; and without reading the history of Islam from the books that have been written for that purpose, so that they grasp the true condition of Islam. Thus, the writer and those similar to him remained in darkness of ignorance concerning transmitted sciences and rational proofs.

Undoubtedly, liars among the scholars of Shia Rafidah are too many and most of them are men of vain desires or ignorance. Therefore, whoever talks to them with what agrees with their desires, they accepted him, and they do not investigate whether he is truthful or a liar and whoever talk to them with what contradicted their vain desire, they will reject him and they will not investigate whether he is truthful or a liar. The Shia Rafidah has the greatest portion of the word of Allah the most high: **“Then, who does more wrong than one who utters a lie against Allah, and denies the truth [this Quran, the Prophet (Muhammad SAW), the Islamic Monotheism, the Resurrection and the reward or punishment according to good or evil deeds] when it comes to him! Is there not in Hell an abode for the disbelievers?” (39:32).** The people of knowledge and religion have the greatest portion of the words of Allah the Most High: **“And he (Muhammad) who has brought the truth (this Quran and Islamic Monotheism) and (those who) believed therein (i.e. the true believers of Islamic Monotheism), those are Al- Muttaqun (the pious and righteous persons - see V.2:2)” (39:33).**

The greatest ignorance and misguidance in the statement of this Rafidi is including Banu Hanifa among the people of consensus and who refused to give him vow of allegiance and to hand over to him their Zakat, he called them apostates, kill them and took them as captives. This type of allegation has been discussed already.

All the people, both the special and the generality knew that Banu Hanifa believed in the prophethood of Musailamah the liar, who claimed to be a partner of Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) in the message. He claimed prophethood a little while before the death of the Prophet (s.a.w). The fact that Musailamah has claimed

prophethood and he was believed and followed by Banu Hanifa is so notorious and distinct that it cannot be hidden except to the person who is far away from knowledge and science. It is one of the greatest virtues of Abubakar to the Islamic community – their first and last – that he fought the apostates, for it is well-known that the greatest people to recant from Islam at that time are Banu Hanifa. He fought them not because they refused giving Zakat. Nay, he fought them because they believed and followed Musailamah the liar and it is said that they numbered one hundred thousand men.

Al-Hanafiyyah is the mother of Muhammad bin Ali bin Ali Talib, popularly known as Ibn Hanafiyyah, who was a war captive of Ali from Banu Hanifa. This is the evidence of those who said among the jurists that it is permissible to take women who apostate from Islam as war captives, if the apostates are being fought (belligerent). Thus if they are protected Muslims; how did Ali permitted taking their women as war captives and have sexual intercourse with one of them?

The Rafidi stated: “Umar objected to fighting apostates.” We reply that: This is the greatest lie and slander against Umar. Nay, all the Prophet’s companions have agreed upon fighting Musailamah and his followers. But there is another group who have accepted Islam and refused to pay the Zakat and these are the people who at the beginning, Umar is doubtful about fighting them to the extent of debating Abubakar, who explained to him the obligation of fighting them and he accepted his evidence. The story concerning this issue is well-known.

Thus, if it is right to criticize Abubakar and Umar and say that they fought in order to collect money, then criticizing other than him is more correct and if it compulsory to defend Uthman and Ali, then defending Abubakar and Umar is more obligatory. Ali fought in order to be obeyed and so that he can be able to administer men and property (wealth and resources): Then how can we say that this is a fight for religion? While Abubakar is fighting those who recanted from Islam, and those who abandoned what Allah has made obligatory

upon them and so that only Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) will be obeyed: Then, how can we say that this is not fighting for religion?

With regard to the people who this Rafidi enumerated as men who refused to give vow of allegiance to Abubakar among the grand companions; then, that is a lie against them except Sa'ad bin Ubadah. Surely, the vow of allegiance given to Abubakar and Umar by those people is well known, attested to, and cannot be denied. This is what has been agreed upon by the scholars of hadith, history and all types of Islamic sciences, generation after generation, right from the predecessors. Usama bin Zaid never advanced with his army until after he gave vow of allegiance to Abubakar and he used to call him: "O successor of the Messenger of Allah." The same thing is the case with all those who he (the Rafidi) has mentioned. Khalid bin Sa'id was a governor of the Prophet (s.a.w) and when he died he said: "I will not be a governor of other than the Prophet." Thus, he left appointment and administration, but he accepted the Caliphate of Abubakar. It is known through concurrent knowledge that only Sa'ad bin Ubadah refused to give him vow of allegiance.

Ali and all Banu Hashim gave their vows of allegiance to Abubakar, by the consensus of scholars and nobody among them died except that he has given him vow of allegiance. But it is said that Ali delayed giving his vow of allegiance for six month and it is said he gave his vow of allegiance on the second day. Any way, they all gave their vows of allegiance without being forced to do so. Furthermore, all the people have given their vows of allegiance to Umar except Sa'ad bin Ubadah and nobody else refused giving him vow of allegiance, neither Banu Hashim, nor any other people. All people without any exception gave the vow of allegiance to Uthman. What the Rafidi mentioned concerning Abu Quhafa (the father of Abubakar) is a lie by consensus of scholars. What happened is that Abu Quhafa is living in Makka and he is a very old man, he embraced Islam in the year of the conquest of Makka. Abubakar brought him to the Prophet (s.a.w) and he said: "You shall have left the old man where he is, so that we go there and see him" (Musnad), as an honor to Abubakar.

The Rafidi stated: “They said to Abu Quhafa: Your son is the oldest among them (the companions)...” We reply that: This is a clear lie, for there are many men among the Prophet’s companions who are older than Abubakar, such as Abbas, for Abbas is older than the Prophet (s.a.w) and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is older than Abubakar.

The Rafidi stated: “They (Shia Rafidah) have rejected consensus as a proof to the Caliphate of Abubakar.”

We reply to the above objection from many perspectives:

Firstly: Certainly, those people that he mentioned did not refuse to give their vows of allegiance to Abubakar except Sa’ad bin Ubadah by the consensus of scholars of hadith. It is said that a group among Banu Hashim did not give their vow of allegiance at the beginning, but they all gave their allegiance after six months^[219] without any fear or inducement from anybody. Certainly, the considered consensus in appointing a leader cannot be harmed or impaired by the refusal of one person or two people or a little group of people from giving vow of allegiance. If such objections are considered, it might be impossible to have consensus on any leadership. Discharging power and authority is the responsibility of a leader and a person can refuse to give his vow of allegiance due to personal desires, such as the refusal of Sa’ad bin Ubadah, for he is about to be a leader from the Ansar, but he does not achieve it and some personal desire remained in his heart. Whoever abandoned a thing due to personal desire, his abandonment is not effective.

Secondly: If we assume that those people have refused to give their vows of allegiance, even if they are more than that – two fold – in number, that will not prevent the establishment of leadership and authority. This is because the main consideration in establishing leadership is the consensus of people of influence (those who can bind and unbind) and the generality of the people who are the support of the affair and with whose aid the goals and aims of leadership are achieved. This is why the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **“You shall remain in the community, for surely, the hand of Allah is with the community” (Tirmdhi).**

Thirdly: We say: the consensus of the Islamic community on the Caliphate of Abubakar is greater than giving their vows of allegiance to Ali. Certainly, one third of the Islamic community – or less or more than that – did not give their vows of allegiance to him. Nay, they fought him, and the other one third did not fight on his side and there are among them people who did not give him their vows of allegiance. Ali fought some of those who did not give him vows of allegiance, while he did not fight others. Therefore, if it is right and permissible to criticize the Caliphate and leadership because some people in the community refuses to give vow of allegiance to the leader; then, criticizing and finding fault with the Caliphate and leadership of Ali is more correct by far measure and consideration.

There is no method by which one can prove that Ali deserved to be the leader, except that the same method can be used to establish that Abubakar deserved to be the Caliph, and that he is more suitable and more deserved to be the leader than Ali and other people. Therefore, consensus is not needed for the establishment of the first Caliphate and the second Caliphate, although it (consensus) has taken place.

SEGMENT: REPLYING THE RAFIDI ON CRITICIZING CONSENSUS ON THE CALIPHATE OF ABUBAKAR

The Rafidi stated: "Furthermore, consensus is not a principle in proving (furnishing proof or evidence). Nay, those who have had consensus must rely on a proof of law, so that they can agree upon it, otherwise it is a mistake. That proof must be either rational, and there is no rational intellectual proof to leadership or textual; and according to them (Ahlu Sunnah), the Prophet died without appointing anybody. There is no text appointing a leader and the Qur'an is devoid of it. Therefore, if consensus is actualized it is a mistake and thus, its evidence is negated."

We reply to the above argument from many perspectives:

Firstly: His statement that: "Consensus is not a principle in proving (furnishing proof or evidence)."

We say: If he means that it is not compulsory to obey those who produce a consensus in themselves (for their own sake), but it is obligatory because it is an evidence to the commands of Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w); then this is correct. This is not harmful for it is not obligatory to obey the command of the Prophet (s.a.w) in itself (for his own sake), but because whoever obeys the Prophet (s.a.w) has really obeyed Allah. Therefore, in reality nobody is obeyed for his (own) sake except Allah; to Him belongs the creation and the command and to Him belongs the decision and there is no decision but for Allah. It is obligatory to obey the Prophet (s.a.w) because obeying him is obedience to Allah and it is obligatory to obey consensus of the Muslims, because obeying it is obedience to Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w). It is obligatory to accept the arbitral decision of the Prophet, because his decision is the decision of Allah; the same rule applies to the arbitral decision of the Islamic community, because its decision is the decision of Allah.

If the Rafidi means by his statement that consensus may agree with the truth and it may contradict the truth; and this is what he want to convey. Then, this is a rejection of consensus as evidence and a claim that the Islamic community can agree on error and

misguidance. Those who held such opinion among the Shia Rafidah who accept this rule explain this.

Therefore, we can say: The claim of Shia that Ali is an infallible Imam and other principles of Shia Imamiyyah Ithna Ashariyyah creed are established through consensus. This is because they rely in their principles of religion upon what they are mentioning as rational proofs, consensus, and what they are transmitting of narrations.

They (Shia Rafidah) are saying: It is known intellectually and rationally, because people must have a Divinely appointed infallible leader and other than Ali is neither appointed by text, nor infallible by consensus. Therefore, the infallible is Ali. They follow the same method while presenting the premises of the principles of their religion.

Then, it will be said to them: If consensus is neither a proof, nor evidence, your proofs are nullified. Therefore, whatever they build upon consensus in their principle of religion is negated and thus, their beliefs are false and since they are false; the beliefs of Ahlus Sunnah are confirmed and affirmed. If consensus is a sound principle, the beliefs of Ahlus Sunnah are also confirmed and affirmed. The falsity of their beliefs is very clear whether they say, consensus is a proof or refused to accept it. With the nullification of their beliefs, the beliefs of Ahlus Sunnah stand established and this is what is required.

If they (Shia Rafidah) say: We do not claim consensus and we do not use it to prove any of our principles of religion, but we rely on intellect and narrations from the infallible leaders.

It will be said to them: If you do not prove your creed with consensus, you no more possess any evidence that carries weight except a sound narration from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Certainly, what they are narrating from Ali and other leaders (Imams) cannot be evidence until we establish the infallibility of one of them and the infallibility of one of them cannot be known except with a sound narration from the person whose infallibility is already established. The person whose infallibility is already established is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and there is no sound narration from

him supporting their beliefs. Absolutely, they do not have any evidence that carries weight, neither in their principles of religion, nor in its branches. At this moment, we refer back to the issue of the claimed textual appointment of Ali. If you (Shia Rafidah) establish the text by consensus, it is nullified, because you do not accept consensus as legal evidence. If you did not establish it except with some special texts that has been narrated by some of you; then, the falsity of such narrations is very clear from many considerations. It is also apparent that what is being narrated by Ahlus Sunnah and most of the Shia (such as Zaydiyyah etc.) which contradicts your statements, has obligated absolute, certain knowledge that your narrations are lies.

SEGMENT: RESPONDING TO THE RAFIDI ON HIS CRITIQUE OF CONSENSUS

The Rafidi stated: “Furthermore, in consensus the opinion of all members of the Islamic community shall be considered. It is well known that this has never happened. Nay, even the consensus of the people of Madina or some of them has never taken place. Most of the people have agreed upon killing Uthman.”

We reply as follows: With regard to consensus upon leadership: If he means by it the consensus by which leadership is established; then in this case what is considered is the agreement of men of influence, through whose aid he can be able to discharge the responsibilities of leadership and achieve its goals. This is achieved even if the leaders of those with influence and might are very few and the rest of them accept what they do or agreed upon it; leadership is established by their vows of allegiance. This is the correct opinion upon which Ahlus Sunnah stand. It is the opinion of our grand scholars, such as Imam Ahmad and others.^[220] The scholastic theologians have estimated it with a number of people and these estimations are false.

If the Rafidi means: Consensus on his suitability and deservedness to be the leader, in this case some things are considered: Either the consensus of all the people or the consensus of the generality of the people and all these three types of consensus has happened with regard to the Caliphate of Abubakar.^[221]

With regard to Uthman; it is very few people (rebels from outside Madina) who agreed on killing him (innocently and in cold blood).

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI CRITICIZED PROVING WITH CONSENSUS

The Rafidi stated: “And furthermore, each and every person in the community can make mistake. Therefore, who can protect them from lying on consensus?”

We reply that: It is well known that when consensus has occurred, it has characteristics that are not possessed by an individual and it is not allowed or acceptable to equate the verdict of an individual with the verdict of the collective. Certainly, every transmitter can lie and or make mistake, but if the transmitters reached the limit of concurrency, mistakes and lies are prevented.

Furthermore, if it is possible for consensus to be a mistake, their claimed infallibility of Ali is not established. This is because – according to their submission, - his infallibility is established because he is the only infallible by consensus. Thus, if consensus can be a mistake, it is possible that there are other infallibles in the community. Therefore, it will not be known that he is the infallible!

Thus, it is clear that their rejection of consensus negate the foundation upon which they relied on the leadership of the infallible. If his being infallible is negated as false, the foundation of Rafidah creed is nullified. Hence, it is clear that if they disparage consensus, the principle of their creed has become false and if they accept that, it is a proof; their creed is nullified. Through this, it became very clear that their creed is false on the two considerations and from all fronts.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI FAULTED CONSENSUS ON ABUBAKAR

The Rafidi sated: “We have certainly, explained the soundness of the text on the Caliphate of Ali. Therefore, if they have agreed on anything contrary to it, they have committed mistake. This is because, any consensus that contradict a sound text is an error according to them (Ahlu Sunnah).

Firstly: We have already presented proofs explaining the falsity of whatever shows that he is a leader to the exclusion of the three Caliphs.

Secondly: All sound texts have proved the Caliphate of the first three Caliphs before him.

Thirdly: We say: It is well known that consensus is a definite proof and not auditory; especially since there are many texts that agreed with it and thus, if we assume that a narration is transmitted which contradicted it, then that text is false; either because the Prophet (s.a.w) has not stated it or because there is no proof in it.

Fourthly: Certainly, contradiction of a determined text and a determined consensus is impossible because they are both definite proofs and decisive proofs do not contradict each other due to the necessity of the existence of its conclusions. If they contradict each other, it is obligatory to combine the antithesis. Certainly, both the determined texts and the determined consensus have proved the Caliphate of Abubakar and negated other arguments or advanced proofs. We knew that the texts advanced by Shia Rafidah are false out of necessity and there are many evidences that proved their falsity and fabrication.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI FAULTED THE HADITH ON FOLLOWING THE FOOTSTEPS OF ABUBAKAR AND UMAR

The Rafidi stated: “Secondly, what they have narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w), that he said: **‘Follow the footsteps of those two after me: Abubakar and Umar.’** We rejected the hadith and rejected its proving of their leadership, for surely, imitating scholars did not mean that they are leaders (with authority). Furthermore, Abubakar and Umar have differed in many legal opinions. Therefore, it is impossible to copy them. Furthermore, this has contradicted the hadith: ‘My companions are like stars, anyone of them you follow, you will be guided.’ And they (the companions) have agreed on denying their leadership.”

The answer to the above arguments is from many perspectives:

Firstly: This hadith as per as the consensus of scholars of hadith is stronger and sounder than all the hadiths they are bringing forward to prove the leadership of Ali. This is a well-known hadith in reliable books of hadiths. Abu Dawud in his Sunan, Ahmad in his Musnad and Tirmidhi in his Jam’i has narrated it. But the texts concerning Ali cannot be traced in any reliable book of hadith and the scholars of hadith have had consensus on their falsity; to the extent that Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm said: “We have never found any hadith concerning this claimed text (on the leadership of Ali), except a flimsy, insubstantial narration on the authority of an unknown person whose agnomen is Aba Hamra; we do not know who he is among human beings” (Fisal, vol. 4, pg. 1616-162). Therefore, faulting this hadith and accepting the hadith concerning Ali is rejected.

With regard to the teachings of the hadith, it shall be understood that the proof is in his expression: **“...those two after me.”** He informed that they will come after him and he commanded that their footsteps should be followed. If they will become unjust, oppressors or unbelievers, he will not command Muslims to follow their footsteps. Certainly, The Messenger of Allah will not command Muslims to imitate oppressors for an oppressor cannot be a good example to

copy by the evidence of the words of Allah: “...**My Covenant includes not Zalimun (polytheists and wrong-doers)**” (2:124). This showed that an unjust person can not be taken as model and taking as a model means imitating. Since he has commanded Muslims to follow their footsteps after him and following footsteps means imitating and that they should be imitated after him, this proved that they are two leaders and he has commanded that they shall be copied and imitated after him; this is what is required and needed.

The Rafidi stated: “They have differed in many legal opinions.” We reply that: The matter is not as he has stated, for differences of opinions between Abubakar and Umar are on very few issues. In most of those differences, there are two opinions from one of them, for example on the issue of inheritance of a grandfather with brother (of the dead person), Umar has two opinions and one of the opinions agreed with that of Abubakar.

The Rafidi stated, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: “my companions are like stars...” We reply that: This hadith is weak, it has been weakened by the scholars of hadith. Al-Barraz said: “This hadith is not sound from the Prophet (s.a.w) and it could not be found in reliable books of hadith.” Furthermore, it does not possess the phrase: “After me.” There is very strong evidence in his word: “After me.” Furthermore, there is no command in it concerning imitating them, but in this hadith there is a very clear, definite command to follow their footsteps.

SEGMENT: THE RAFIDI ATTACK AND DISPARAGE ABUBAKAR

The Rafidi stated: “Thirdly, what has been mentioned concerning his virtues (by Ahlus Sunnah), like the verse of the cave, and the words of Allah: **“And the pious (and righteous) will be far removed from it (Hell)” (92:17).** And the words of Allah: **“Say (O Muhammad SAW) to the bedouins who lagged behind: ‘You shall be called to fight against a people given to great warfare...’” (48:16).** The one who will invite them is Abubakar. He is with the Prophet (s.a.w) in the shade during the battle of Badr. He spent on the Prophet (s.a.w) and he was forwarded to lead prayer.”

The Rafidi (criticizing the above virtues) stated: “Answer to the above claims is that there is no virtue with his being in the cave with the Prophet (s.a.w), because the Prophet (s.a.w) asked him to follow him as a precautionary measure against him, so that he will not reveal his secret (i.e. his whereabouts). Furthermore, the revealed verse showed that there is no virtue in his being together with the Prophet (s.a.w) in the cave due to his words: “Do not be sad.” This shows his weakness, little patience, imperfection, his displeasure with being with the Prophet (s.a.w) and his lack of acceptance of the decree of Allah and His preordainment. Furthermore, if being sad is an act of obedience to Allah, it will be impossible for the Prophet (s.a.w) to stop him. And if it is an act of disobedience, what they claimed to be a virtue is baseness. Furthermore, whenever the Qur’an mention sending down tranquility to the Prophet (s.a.w), it will include the believers except in this verse and this a great blemish.

With regard to the words of Allah: **“And the pious (and righteous) will be far removed from it (Hell)” (92:17).** The verse is talking about Abu Dahdah, when he bought a date tree for his neighbor. The Prophet (s.a.w) has offered to the owner of the date tree recompense with a date tree in Paradise, but he refused. When Abu Dahdah heard the issue, he exchanged the date tree with his garden and gave it to the neighbor and the Prophet (s.a.w) promised him a replacement of his garden in Paradise.

With regard to the words of Allah: **Say (O Muhammad SAW) to the bedouins who lagged behind: ‘You shall be called to fight against a people given to great warfare...’ (48:16).** The verse means, you will be invited to fight a people with great warfare. If he means those who did not attend Hudaibiyyah and they sought to go after the booty of Khaibar, but Allah prevented them with His words: **Say: You shall not follow us... (48:16).** He means in the verse: You will later on be invited to fight a people with a great fighting spirit. The Prophet (s.a.w) has invited them to many battles, such as the battle of Mu’atah, Hunain and Tabuk etc., thus, the one who will invite them, is the Prophet (s.a.w) (and not Abubakar). Furthermore, it is possible the one who will invite them is Ali, for he fought those who have renounced their vows of allegiance, those who refused to offer him their vows of allegiance and those who dissented and rebelled. Their acceptance to obey is part of Islam, because the Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: “O Ali! Fighting you is fighting me.” And fighting the Prophet (s.a.w) is unbelief.

With regard to Abubakar’s staying with the Prophet (s.a.w) in the shade on the day of the battle of Badr; it is not a virtue. This is because the intimate companion of the Prophet (s.a.w) is Allah and He suffices him from the need for any companion. The Prophet knew that if he allowed Abubakar to fight, it will lead to bad result because he fled and run away many times from the battle fields. Which of these two things is better; sitting down without fighting or striving with himself and fighting for the sake of Allah? With regard to the claim that he has been spending his wealth on the Prophet (s.a.w); that is a lie because he does not possess any wealth. Certainly, his father was very poor to the extent that he is every day given some measure of foodstuffs by Abdullah bin Jud’an. Thus, if Abubakar has wealth, he will have provided for his father. During the period before Islam Abubakar was a teacher of children and during the period of Islam he was a tailor. When he became the Caliph people prevented him from tailoring. He said: ‘But I need food!’ Therefore, they made a salary of three Dirham, daily for him from the state treasury. Before immigrating to Madina, the Prophet (s.a.w) is sufficiently provided for

by Khadija and there is no requirement for fighting and preparing armies. After the immigration, Abubakar is absolutely poor and if he has spent on the Prophet (s.a.w) it is obligatory to reveal it in the Qur'an, in the same manner that Chapter Seventy Six (76) of the Qur'an was revealed concerning Ali. It is well-known that the Prophet (s.a.w) is more honored than those who Ali gave charity and the wealth they are claiming was spent on the Prophet (s.a.w) was greater; since nothing has been revealed concerning it in the Qur'an, this proves that it is a lie.

Putting Abubakar forward to lead prayer was a mistake, because when Bilal called for prayer, Aisha commanded that Abubakar shall be asked to lead it and when the Prophet (s.a.w) regained consciousness (after fainting) and he heard the voice of Abubakar leading the Prayer. He asked: 'Who is leading people in prayer?' They replied: 'Abubakar!' He said: 'Take me out.' He went out leaning on Ali and Abbas, he removed him from leading the prayer and prayed with them by himself.

The Rafidi concluded his attacks saying: These are the conditions of the proofs of Ahlus Sunnah (concerning the Caliphate of Abubakar) Therefore, let the intellectual, rational person assess them with justice; with the intention of following the truth instead of following vain desires. Let him abandon aping and imitating parents, for Allah has prohibited doing that in His book. Let the life of this world not take him away or deceive him from conveying the truth to the person who deserved it and he shall not refuse to deliver right to the one who deserved it. This is the least thing we want to affirm in this premise."

We reply stating: The above statement contained a lot of lies, untruth, slanders and false accusations that are not known among any sect of the sects that ascribed themselves to Islam. Certainly, the Shia Rafidah have a very strong similarity with the Jews, for they are people given to slander and false accusations. They want to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will not agree until He complete His light even if the unbelievers hates it.

The clarity of the virtues of Abubakar and Umar are more apparent to every rational human being than the virtues of any other person. Those Shia Rafidah want to upturn the reality. They have a great portion in the words of Allah the Most High: **“Then, who does more wrong than one who utters a lie against Allah, and denies the truth, when it comes to him! Is there not in Hell an abode for the disbelievers?” (39:32).** And His words, the Most High: **“So who does more wrong than he who forges a lie against Allah or denies His proofs? Surely, the criminals will never be successful!” (10:17),** and other similar verses. The Shia Rafidah is the greatest group in denying the truth and accepting falsehood. There is no group in the Islamic community that is similar to them (in those bad traits).

The Rafidi stated: “There is no virtue for him (Abubakar) in the cave (for being with the Prophet in the cave on their way to Madina as immigrants).

We reply that: Surely, the virtue of being in the cave is clearly spelt by the text of the Qur’an, where Allah, the Most High said: **“... And he said to his companion: ‘Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us...” (9:40).** Here the Prophet (s.a.w) informed Abubakar that Allah is with them (he and his companion), in the same manner, that Allah told Moses (a.s) and Aaron (a.s): **“He (Allah) said: “Fear not, verily! I am with you both, hearing and seeing” (20:46).** It comes in sound hadith from Anas bin Malik who reported that Abubakar reported to him thus: ***“I saw the feet of the polytheists very close to us as we were in the cave. I said: Allah's Messenger, if one amongst them were to see at his feet he would have surely seen us. Thereupon he said: Abubakar, what can befall twain who have Allah as the third One with them” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** This hadith is among the hadiths which soundness has been agreed upon by the scholars of hadith; they have accepted it and believed in it. This is among what the Qur’an has indicated its meaning when it stated: **“... And he said to his companion: ‘Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us...” (9:40).** This is the utmost companionship of Abubakar, for it showed that he is among those who Allah testify

to their faith. It also entailed aid and support of Allah for him together with His messenger (s.a.w) in this type of situation in which Allah explained that He suffices them from the need of all human beings. He the Most High said: **“If you help him (the Prophet) not (it does not matter), for Allah did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out, the second of two, when they (the Prophet and Abubakar) were in the cave...” (9:40).** This is why Sufyan bin Uyainah and other scholars said: “Allah has blamed all human beings regarding his Prophet (s.a.w) except Abubakar.” And he said: “Whoever denied that Abubakar has accompanied the Prophet (s.a.w) is an unbeliever because he has denied the Qur’an.” Some scholars such as Abul Qasim al-Suhaili and others said: “Devotedness, closeness and intimacy (with the Prophet) is only confirmed to Abubakar.” The same thing could be said about the words of the Prophet (s.a.w): **“... what can befall two people who have Allah as the third One with them” (Bukhari, Muslim).** Nay, their intimacy and exclusiveness in this expression as it appeared in its meaning. The Prophet (s.a.w) is called, “Muhammad the Messenger of Allah.” When Abubakar became the Caliph, they started calling him, “The successor of the Messenger of Allah.” They thus attributed him to the Messenger (s.a.w) and to Allah, and the one who is attributed to the person who is attributed to Allah, is in reality attributed to Allah, due to His words: **“...surely Allah is with us...” (9:40),** and **“... what can befall two people who have Allah as the third One with them” (Bukhari, Muslim).** When Umar become the caliph, they started calling him, “Commander of the Faithfuls,” and thus, the exclusiveness and special attachment to the Prophet (s.a.w) which is specific to Abubakar among the companions was cut up.

Whoever studied the numerous virtues of Abubakar that come in sound hadiths, which are his exclusive traits (will realize that he is not preceded by anybody), such as the hadith of taking bosom friend (Khalil), the hadith of certainly Allah is with us, the hadith of he is the most beloved to the Prophet among men, the hadith in which he commanded a lady to come to Abubakar after him, the hadith of his

intention to write document for his successorship after him, the hadith of calling him as-Siddiq to the exclusion of all others, the hadith of companionship, the hadith that forbids molesting Abubakar, the hadith in which Abubakar defended the Prophet (s.a.w) in Makka when he was attacked by 'Aqbah bin Mu'it when he placed a garment on his neck until he was secured by Abubakar while he saying to the polytheists; "Do you kill a man for saying Allah is my lord!" And the hadith of appointing him as his successor to lead prayer during his terminal illness, the hadith of appointing him to lead the pilgrimage, his patience and remaining steadfast after the prophet (s.a.w) died, the Islamic community accepted him as their leader and submitted to him, the hadith of entering Paradise by the person who possessed some combined virtues (visiting the sick, fasting, following a bier, feeding the needy – all in a day).

What we aimed at here is to explain his special exclusive virtues in the companionship of belief, in areas which he did not share with anybody, neither in its estimation, nor in its description, nor in its benefits. Certainly, if one counted the periods in which Abubakar meet the Prophet (s.a.w) and the periods in which Uthman, Ali and other companions meet with him, he will find that what is exclusive to Abubakar is hundred-folds of what is exclusive of any one of them; I am not saying double. What all of them share (of virtues and outstanding traits) is not exclusive to anybody.

The perfect knowledge of Abubakar with regard to the Prophet (s.a.w), his love for him, his acceptance of his words and mission are well-known to the extent that he is certainly a pacesetter in all those areas, over all the other companions, to such degrees that they are not hidden to any person who knew their conditions, conducts and history and the testimonies of whoever did not know these things cannot be accepted. The same thing could be said about his benefits to the Prophet (s.a.w) and his support for him and the religion of Islam. Those things are the goals of companionship and its commendable praiseworthy acts, by which the companions deserved to be preferred over all other people. Abubakar has many exclusive traits by their estimation, their types, their characteristics, and their

benefits in which nobody shared them with him. It come in sound hadiths; ***“Abu Sa'id reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) sat on the pulpit and said: Allah gave a choice to His servant that he may opt the beauties of the world or that which is with Him and the servant chose that which was with Him. Thereupon Abubakar wept and he wept bitterly and said: Let our fathers and our mothers be taken as ransom for you. It was Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) who had been given the choice and Abubakar knew it better than us, and Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) is reported to have said: Behold, of all people the most generous toward me in regard to his companionship and his property was Abubakar and were I to choose anyone as my bosom friend, I would have chosen Abubakar as my dear friend, but (for him) I cherish Islamic brotherliness and love. There shall be left open no window in the mosque except Abu Bakr's window” (Bukhari, Muslim).***

It come in another hadith, 'Abdullah bin Mas'ud reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: ***“If I were to choose a bosom friend I would have definitely chosen Abu Bakr as my bosom friend, but he is my brother and my companion and Allah, the Exalted and Glorious. has taken your brother and companion (meaning Prophet himself) as a friend” (Muslim).*** In yet another hadith, Abdullah reported Allah's Messenger (s.a.w) as saying: ***“If I were to choose from my Umma (community) anyone as my bosom friend, I would have chosen Abu Bakr” (Muslim).*** This hadith has been narrated through another chain of transmitters and the one narrated on the authority of Abdullah (the words are): ***“Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) is reported to have said: Behold I am free from the dependence of all bosom friends and if I were to choose anyone as bosom friend I would have taken Abu Bakr as my bosom friend. Allah has taken your companion as a friend” (Muslim).***

All those texts explained the exclusiveness of Abubakar with the virtues of companionship; its excellence and its outstanding traits;

raising up to its responsibilities and discharging its rights in such a manner that nobody shared with him, to the extent that it necessitated the Prophet (s.a.w) to take him as a bosom friend to the exclusion of all other human beings, if taking a bosom friend is permissible to him.

Those texts shows clearly that he is the most beloved of Allah's created beings to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) as has been soundly reported in the hadith of 'Amr bin 'As, where he said: ***"The Prophet deputed me to lead the Army of Dhat-as-Salasil. I came to him and said, 'Who is the most beloved person to you?' He said, 'Aisha.' I asked, 'Among the men?' He said, 'Her father.' I said, 'Who then?' He said, 'Then 'Umar bin Al-Khattab.' He then named other men"*** (Bukhari, Muslim). In another version in Bukhari he said: ***"Then I kept quite fearing to be made the last among them"*** (Bukhari).

SEGMENT: EXPLAINING THE VIRTUES AND EXCELLENCE OF ABUBAKAR IN THE CAVE

Among the things that showed the virtues and excellence of Abubakar while in the cave (with the Messenger of Allah) is that Allah the Most High mentioned His aid to his Messenger (s.a.w), at a time when he was abandoned and rejected by the generality of human beings, except the one who is aided by Allah the Most High: **“If you help him not (it does not matter), for Allah did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out, the second of two, when they were in the cave...” (9:40).** The verse means that he was expelled in this little number, in which his companion is only one person and one is the least number. Certainly, one is the least number and if only one person accompanies him, it indicated the utmost limit of lesser number.

Then Allah the Most High said: **“... and he (s.a.w) said to his companion (Abu Bakr radhiallahu'anhu): ‘Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us...’ (9:40).** This showed that his companion pitied him and sympathizes with him, he loves him and supports him and thus he is sad. Certainly, when one become sad when he feared that some evil may befall the one he loves, while he will not be sad when something that will destroy his enemy befalls him. Thus, if Abubakar hates the Prophet (s.a.w) – as the slanderers are saying – he will not be sad. Nay, in that case, he will hide in himself happiness and delight and the Prophet (s.a.w) will not say to him: **“Be not sad (or afraid)” (9:40).**

If the slanderers, liars say: Certainly, his true condition is hidden to the Prophet (s.a.w) when he feigned sadness, while in his heart he is hiding hatred to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

We will reply that: He has said: **“... Surely, Allah is with us...” (9:40).** This is an information that Allah is with both of them with His aid and support. It is not permissible to the Prophet (s.a.w) to give information about the aid of Allah for His Prophet and believers and that he is with them, while in his (the person he is giving the information) heart he is a hypocrite. Certainly, the Prophet is infallible

concerning all what he has conveyed from Allah and he will never say concerning Allah but the truth.

Furthermore, it is well known that even the most foolish person will understand the true nature and condition of his companion in this type of travel (and companionship). He is living in a community where many people are displaying enmity against him and they are trying to kill him, while his friends at that place cannot be able to aid him in this situation. How can that man accompany an individual who has shown him his love and support, and displaying sadness as to what will befall him while in reality he is his enemy at heart and his companion will be thinking that he loves him and supports him! This kind of conduct can only be made by the most foolish and the most ignorant among men. Therefore, may Allah change the features of the person who made this statement against the most perfect of His created beings in intellect, knowledge and experience to the ugliest form. How can he ascribe to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) these types of ignorance and foolishness?

The Rafidi stated: "It is possible that he accompanied him, as a form of precaution, so that he does not divulge his secrets."

We reply that: Certainly, this claim is false and its falsity can be proven through many perspectives that cannot be exhausted through study. Among them are the following:

Firstly: He (the Messenger of Allah) certainly knew through the evidences of the Qur'an that he (Abubakar) loves him and supports him, and that he is not his enemy. Therefore, claim of the Rafidi is null.

Secondly: It is certainly known through concurrent traditions that Abubakar loves the Prophet (s.a.w) and believe in him and that he is one of the greatest human beings that has special relationship with him, in greater measure than the stories on the bravery of Antar, the generosity of Hatim and the love and support of Ali for him. Doubting the love of Abubakar to the Prophet (s.a.w) is like doubting the love of others for him and greater. Among the Shia Rafidah, there are those who are doubting that Abubakar and Umar are buried in the room of the Prophet (s.a.w). Among the extra extreme Rafidah there

are those who denied that Abubakar is his companion in the cave. This is not an impossible slander to them for certainly they are a people given to slander. They denied what is known and affirmed to have occurred out of necessity and they claimed the occurrence of what is known to be false by the necessities of transmitted narrations and rational evidences.

Thirdly: The Rafidi stated: "He accompanied him as a precaution, in order to prevent him from revealing his secrets."

We reply that: This is a statement of the most ignorant person with regard to what has occurred. The knowledge that the Prophet (s.a.w) is going to immigrate is well known to the people of Makka, and they sent people after him. They knew in the morning of the night he left Makka that he is on his way to Madina. The story spread everywhere. They sent messages to those on the roads offering recompense to whoever intercepts him or Abubakar. Then, what is he afraid of (concerning Abubakar)?

The polytheists of Makka offering recompense and reward to whoever will bring back Abubakar (dead or alive) is a great evidence showing that they knew that he loves and supports the Prophet (s.a.w) and that he is their enemy deep down in his heart.

Fourthly: Certainly, if the Prophet (s.a.w) sneaks out of Makka in the night, and the time of his leaving the city is not be known by anybody. Then, what will he do with Abubakar and taking him with him (what is the logic behind that)?

If they (the Shia Rafidah) say: May be he knew when he is leaving the city to the exclusion of all other people!

We reply that: Firstly, he can be able to travel at a time when he will not know when he is leaving the town, in the same manner that he left the town without anybody among the polytheists knowing it. It is possible for the Prophet (s.a.w) to travel without him for no one knew of any plans he might have had; not even Abubakar, who had been commanded to keep two beasts alert and ready ever since he asked the Prophet for permission to emigrate and the Prophet advised him to wait. Muhammad (s.a.w) remained in Makka until he learned of

the Quraish's plot to assassinate him, and until none but the fewest Muslims were still left there with him. He waited for the command of his Lord for emigration. When, finally, that command did come, he went to the house of Abubakar and informed him of the permission Allah had granted. He asked Abubakar to accompany him on the trip.

It come in sound hadiths and one of them was narrated Aisha who said: ***“Rarely did the Prophet fail to visit Abu Bakr’s house everyday, either in the morning or in the evening. When the permission for migration to Medina was granted, all of a sudden the Prophet came to us at noon and Abu Bakr was informed, who said, “Certainly the Prophet has come for some urgent matter.” The Prophet said to Abubakar, when the latter entered “Let nobody stay in your home.” Abubakar said, “O Allah’s Apostle! There are only my two daughters (namely ‘Aisha and Asma’) present.” The Prophet said, “I feel (am informed) that I have been granted the permission for migration.” Abubakar said, “I will accompany you, O Allah’s Apostle!” The Prophet said, “You will accompany me.” Abubakar then said “O Allah’s Apostle! I have two she-camels I have prepared specially for migration, so I offer you one of them. The Prophet said, “I have accepted it on the condition that I will pay its price”” (Bukhari).*** Therefore, the Prophet (s.a.w) alone knew the time he intended to leave Makka.

Fifthly: Nobody knew of their hiding place in the cave except 'Abdullah, son of Abubakar, his two sisters, A'isha and Asma', and their servant 'Amir ibn Fuhairah. 'Abdullah spent his day in Makka listening to what the Quraish said and plotted about Muhammad (s.a.w) and then reported it to the pair at their hideout under cover of night. 'Amir grazed the sheep of Abubakar and passed by the cave in the evening in order to give them some milk and meat. Upon 'Abdullah's return from the cave, 'Amir would follow him with all his sheep and then conceal any trace of his steps. For three long days, the pair remained in the cave and the Quraysh persistently looked for them without avail. For the Quraish it was absolutely necessary to

find Muhammad and to prevent his emigration to Yathrib. Therefore, it is possible for Abubakar to leak their whereabouts to the polytheists through his children and servants if he is part of the enemies as claimed by the liars, slanderers, Shia Rafidah.

Sixthly: If that is the case and the enemies are above them outside the cave. Is it not possible for Abubakar to come out of the cave and inform the enemies about the Prophet (s.a.w)? He is alone with him, nobody can protect him from him and from the enemies. Whoever hates a person and want to destroy him will take this opportunity in this type of situation, in which no enemy will take on his enemy without overcoming him. He is surely alone in the cave.

SEGMENT: DEFENCE OF ABUBAKAR AND HIS EXCELLENCE IN THE EPISODE OF THE CAVE

The Rafidi stated: "This proved his imperfections for Allah said (in the tongue of His Prophet): **"Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us" (9:40)**. The verse showed his weakness, little patience, his displeasure with being with the Prophet (s.a.w) and his lack of acceptance of the decree of Allah and His preordainment."

We reply that: Firstly: This statement has contradicted your earlier statement where you stated: "He asked him to accompany him so that he will not reveal his secret." Because if he is his enemy, he must be having in his heart the like of the enmity of those who are seeking for him and thus, he shall be necessarily happy and delighted and he will be contented and self-assured at the arrival of the enemy. Furthermore, the enemies have arrived and walk on the cave. Thus, he shall have notified them and invited them to catch him. Furthermore, the person who is bringing the story of the polytheists to them, while in the cave is his son Abdullah and thus, he shall have commanded his son to inform them the whereabouts of the Prophet (s.a.w). Furthermore, his servant 'Amir bin Fuhairah is the person who is taking care of their mounts. It is possible to command his servant: "Inform them where he is!"

The contradictory statements of this Rafidi nullified their beliefs that he was a hypocrite and affirmed our belief that he is a believer in the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Undoubtedly, there are no hypocrites among the Muhajirun, but there are some hypocrites among the clans of Ansar. This is because everybody that has immigrated does so with his choice and no unbeliever in Makka ever chose to immigrate and abandon his country and family in order to aid his enemy. Since this explanation necessitated his belief, it is well known that the Prophet (s.a.w) will not chose who will accompany him in this dreadful immigration except the person who he trust, who is the closest to him and who his heart is rest assured with him. This is enough as a virtue and excellence for Abubakar and it differentiated him from other than him (among the companions). This

is among the virtues of Abubakar in which nobody share it with him and it showed that he is the best and the choicest of his companions to him.

The Rafidi stated: "It showed his defects and imperfections..." We reply that: There are two types of imperfections or defects: A defect that nullified belief and a defect in comparison with a person who is more perfect than him. If he means the first type; then that is null and void. Surely Allah has said to His Messenger (s.a.w): **"... And grieve not over them (polytheists and pagans, etc.), and be not distressed because of what they plot" (16:127).** And He said to the believers: **"So do not become weak (against your enemy), nor be sad, and you will be superior (in victory) if you are indeed (true) believers" (3:139).** In another verse Allah the Most High said: **"And indeed, We have bestowed upon you seven of Al-Mathani (the seven repeatedly recited Verses), (i.e. Surat Al-Fatiha) and the Grand Quran. Look not with your eyes ambitiously at what We have bestowed on certain classes of them (the disbelievers), nor grieve over them. And lower your wings for the believers (be courteous to the fellow-believers). (15:87-88).** Therefore, Allah the Most High has asked His Prophet (s.a.w) not to be sad in many places in the Qur'an and He generally asked believers not to be sad, thus, being sad does not negate belief.

If the Rafidi means that he is defective and imperfect in comparison to the person who is more perfect than him; then, without any tinge of doubt the condition of the Prophet (s.a.w) is more perfect than the condition of Abubakar. In this case, there is no any disagreement or divergent view among Ahlus Sunnah! But there is nothing in this explanation which showed that Ali, or Uthman or Umar or anyone else is better than him. This is because they have not been with the Prophet (s.a.w) in this situation and even if they are with him it will not be known if their condition will be more perfect than the condition of Abubakar. Nay, it is well-known through his conducts and their conducts, that always and in all situations and during the time of fear, that he is more perfect than all of them in certitude, confidence and

composure.^[222] And whenever the Prophet (s.a.w) is upset Abubakar is the most ardent follower of what pleases him and the farthest away from what will offend him. These are well-known conditions to whoever study their conducts both during the life of the Prophet (s.a.w) and after his death.

Furthermore, the episodes of the day of Badr and the day of Hudaibiyyah showed his certitude, his composure, calmness and confidence; these traits become clearer to his credit over all the companions. Therefore, how can such a person be ascribed to impatience? Furthermore, his standing up to the occasion to fight the apostates and those who refused to pay Zakat, in addition to making the believers remain steadfast and dispatching the army of Usama showed that he is the greatest person in certitude and confidence.

A Sunni do not argue on the precedence of Abubakar over Umar and Uthman, but the Shia Rafidi is claiming that Ali is more perfect than all the three men with regard to these characteristics. His claims are nothing but lies, slander and untruth, for surely whoever study and ponder over the conducts of Umar and Uthman will realize that their patience, remaining steadfast and lack of weakness during the period of tribulation are more perfect than that of Ali. The enemies of Uthman lay siege against him and surrounded him from all sides and they requested him to resign from his position or they will kill him. They continued laying siege upon him until they killed him, while he was preventing people from fighting them in his defense. Up to the time when they killed the martyred Uthman, he never defended himself. What is this other than patience in trial and tribulation? It is well-known that the patience of Ali has not reached the patience of Uthman. Nay, Ali used to display and show concern, displeasure, impatience and being upset or offended by his army who are fighting together with him and from the army he is fighting in a manner that has not been displayed by the other Caliphs.

The Rafidi stated: "This showed his weakness, little patience, his displeasure of being with the Prophet (s.a.w) and lack of acceptance of the decree of Allah and His preordainment."

We reply that: All these are clear distinct lies from the Rafidi. There is nothing in the verse that indicates what he stated. We respond to him from two perspectives:

Firstly: Forbidding a thing does not show that it has occurred. Nay, it showed that he is forbidden to commit that thing and so that he does not commit it afterwards. Allah the Most high has said: **“O Prophet (Muhammad)! Keep your duty to Allah, and obey not the disbelievers and the hypocrites (i.e., do not follow their advices). Verily! Allah is Ever AllKnower, AllWise” (33:1).** This verse does not mean that the Prophet (s.a.w) used to obey the unbelievers and the hypocrites.

Secondly: If we assume that he was sad, then his sadness is for the Prophet (s.a.w), fearing that he will be killed and the affairs of Islam terminated. He wanted to sacrifice himself for the Prophet (s.a.w) and that is why he accompanied him in this grand journey of migration. He used to walk in front of him for a moment and behind him for a moment. The Prophet asked him concerning that and he replied: ***“When I think about those who are laying ambush, I walk in front of you and when I think about those who are after you I walk behind you” (Muslim).***

Therefore, his displeasure with being the Prophet (s.a.w) is not as stated by this slanderer, liar. Certainly, Abubakar does not accept that they are both killed. Nay, he does not accept that the Prophet is killed and he lives. Nay, he wanted and chose to sacrifice himself, his family and his wealth (for the Messenger of Allah to live). This is an obligation upon all believers and Abubakar discharged this responsibility more than all the believers. Allah the Most High said: **“The Prophet is closer to the believers than their ownelves, and his wives are their (believers') mothers (as regards respect and marriage)...” (33:6).** In sound hadith the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“None of you is a true believer until I become more beloved to him than his children, his parents and all people” (Bukhari, Muslim).*** Thus his being sad that something evil will befall the Prophet (s.a.w) is part of his perfect love, support and warding away any evil from the Prophet (s.a.w), in addition to his being cautious,

vigilant and being ever ready to stand in his defense. These are traits of the most outstanding greatest belief!

The Rafidi stated: "This shows his impatience."

We reply that: This is a false statement. Nay, it did not show his lack of permitted patience. Certainly, being patient over calamities is obligatory as decreed by the Book of Allah and the Sunnah and sadness of the heart does not deny patience. The prophet (s.a.w) said: **"... Allah does not punish for the tears that the eye sheds or the sadness (grief) the heart feels, but He punishes for this (pointing to his tongue), or He may show mercy" (Muslim).**

The Rafidi stated: "This showed his lack of confidence in Allah and acceptance of the decree of Allah and His preordainment."

We reply that: This is a slander and a lie. Certainly, Prophets have been sad and that did not show their lack of certitude or conviction or belief and trust in Allah. Allah the Most High has informed us about Prophet Jacob (a.s) when he said: **"He said: 'I only complain of my grief and sorrow to Allah, and I know from Allah that which you know not'" (12:86).** And it come in sound hadith that after the death of his son Ibrahim the Prophet (s.a.w) said: **"The eyes are shedding tears and the heart is saddened, and we will not say except what pleases our Lord, O Ibrahim ! Indeed we are grieved by your separation" (Bukhari).** Allah has forbidden the Prophet from being sad when he said: **"And endure you patiently (O Muhammad), your patience is not but from Allah. And grieve not over them (polytheists and pagans, etc.), and be not distressed because of what they plot" (16:127).**

SEGMENT: CONTINUED DEFENSE OF ABUBAKAR ON THE EPISODE OF THE CAVE

The Rafidi stated: "If being sad is an act of obedience, it will be impossible for the Prophet (s.a.w) to stop him and if it is an act of disobedience, what they claimed to be a virtue is a deficiency."

We reply that: Nobody claimed that mere sadness is the excellence or the virtue. Nay, the virtue is in the words of Allah the Most High: **"If you help him (Muhammad) not (it does not matter), for Allah did indeed help him when the disbelievers drove him out, the second of two, when they (Muhammad – s.a.w - and Abubakar – r.a) were in the cave, and he (s.a.w) said to his companion (Abubakar): "Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us...." (9:40).** The virtue and excellence is that he is the person who accompanied the Prophet (s.a.w) in that condition; he exclusively accompanied him and he has perfect fellowship of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w); his love for him, his being vigilant for him, and his perfect aid and support for him. These are the conducts that showed his perfect belief and fear of Allah, and they are the virtues. His perfect support, aid, and love for the Prophet (s.a.w) necessitated his sadness. This is if he has become sad for the Qur'an did not say that he has become sad, as already explained.

Secondly: The very same command exist in the words of Allah to His Prophet (s.a.w): **"And endure you patiently (O Muhammad), your patience is not but from Allah. And grieve not over them (polytheists and pagans, etc.), and be not distressed because of what they plot" (16:127).** And His words: **"Look not with your eyes ambitiously at what We have bestowed on certain classes of them (the disbelievers), nor grieve over them. And lower your wings for the believers (be courteous to the fellow-believers)" (15:88).** And there are similar cases. Nay, Allah said to Prophet Moses (a.s): **"Allah said: 'Grasp it, and fear not,' We shall return it to its former state" (20:21).**

If it is said: "If fear is an act of obedience, he has been asked to stop it and if it is an act of disobedience, he has really disobeyed."

We reply: He was commanded to be tranquil and remain steadfast, because fear descend upon man without his choice in a situation where security is not guaranteed, but when security is guaranteed, fear disappear. The same thing with the words of the Prophet (s.a.w) to his companion: **“Do not be sad...” (9:40)**. Asking him not to be sad is joined with what removes sadness, which is: **“Surely Allah is with us...” (9:40)**. When information is given which necessitate removal of fear and sadness they will cease to exist (in the heart). Certainly, sadness and fear attacks man without his choice.

Thirdly: As already explained, asking a person not to be sad does not prove that he is sad. Nay, he might be asked not to be sad in order to prevent its occurrence, if there are things that will necessitate its occurrence. Hence, its being an act of disobedience will not harm us. If sadness has occurred; the command not to be sad is a form of comforting, consolation and strengthening even though what is forbidden is not a sin. Nay, it could be among the things that occurred without the choice of the person prevented from doing it. The sadness under discussion may be of this type.

Fourthly: It is part of the conduct of all intelligent human beings that if they live with a person for a certain period, he will understand whether he is a friend or an enemy. The Prophet live in Makka with Abubakar for more than eighteen years and he still does not know whether he is his friend or his enemy and he used to held meetings with him in the house of fear (Makka)? Is this not a form of finding fault against the Prophet (s.a.w)?

Furthermore, all the people knew that he is his greatest, closest friend, since the time he was sent as a Prophet (s.a.w) up to the time he died. Certainly, he is the first person to believe in him among free men, and he invited other people to belief and they embraced Islam. He spent his money to free those who believe in the Prophet (s.a.w) among the oppressed, such as Bilal etc., he used to accompany him during the period of the pilgrimage inviting people to Islam. The Prophet (s.a.w) used to visit him every day either in the morning or in the evening. The unbelievers have harmed Abubakar because of him, to the extent that he went out of Makka with the intention of

immigrating to another place so that he can worship his Lord without harassment, and he was met on his way by Ibn Daghina, one of the leaders of Arabs and the chief of al-Qarah, who asked him: "Where are you going?" The hadith runs as follows:

Narrated 'Aisha: (the wife of the Prophet) I never remembered my parents believing in any religion other than the true religion (i.e. Islam), and (I don't remember) a single day passing without our being visited by Allah's Apostle in the morning and in the evening. When the Muslims were put to test (i.e. troubled by the pagans), Abub akar set out migrating to the land of Ethiopia, and when he reached Bark-al-Ghimad, Ibn Ad-Daghina, the chief of the tribe of Qara, met him and said, "O Abubakar! Where are you going?" Abu Bakr replied, "My people have turned me out (of my country), so I want to wander on the earth and worship my Lord." Ibn Ad-Daghina said, "O Abubakar! A man like you should not leave his homeland, nor should he be driven out, because you help the destitute, earn their livings, and you keep good relations with your Kith and kin, help the weak and poor, entertain guests generously, and help the calamity-stricken persons. Therefore I am your protector. Go back and worship your Lord in your town."

So Abubakar returned and Ibn Ad-Daghina accompanied him. In the evening Ibn Ad-Daghina visited the nobles of Quraish and said to them. "A man like Abubakar should not leave his homeland, nor should he be driven out. Do you (i.e. Quraish) drive out a man who helps the destitute, earns their living, keeps good relations with his Kith and kin, helps the weak and poor, entertains guests generously and helps the calamity-stricken persons?" So the people of Quraish could not refuse Ibn Ad-Daghina's protection, and they said to Ibn Ad-Daghina, "Let Abubakar worship his Lord in his house. He can pray and recite there whatever he likes, but he should not hurt us with it, and should not do it publicly, because we are afraid that he may affect our women and children." Ibn Ad-Daghina told Abubakar of all that. Abubakar stayed in that state, worshipping his Lord

in his house. He did not pray publicly, nor did he recite Quran outside his house.

Then a thought occurred to Abubakar to build a mosque in front of his house, and there he used to pray and recite the Quran. The women and children of the pagans began to gather around him in great number. They used to wonder at him and look at him. Abubakar was a man who used to weep too much, and he could not help weeping on reciting the Quran. That situation scared the nobles of the pagans of Quraish, so they sent for Ibn Ad-Daghina. When he came to them, they said, "We accepted your protection of Abubakar on condition that he should worship his Lord in his house, but he has violated the conditions and he has built a mosque in front of his house where he prays and recites the Quran publicly. We are now afraid that he may affect our women and children unfavorably. So, prevent him from that. If he likes to confine the worship of his Lord to his house, he may do so, but if he insists on doing that openly, ask him to release you from your obligation to protect him, for we dislike to break our pact with you, but we deny Abubakar the right to announce his act publicly." Ibn Ad-Daghina went to Abubakar and said, ("O Abubakar!) You know well what contract I have made on your behalf; now, you are either to abide by it, or else release me from my obligation of protecting you, because I do not want the 'Arabs hear that my people have dishonored a contract I have made on behalf of another man." Abubakar replied, "I release you from your pact to protect me, and am pleased with the protection from Allah (Bukhari)".

Therefore, can anybody who has little intellect doubt that this type of thing cannot be done except by a person who has reached the utmost limit of support, aid and love of the Prophet (s.a.w) and what he has brought of guidance and the religion of truth! And that his support and aid of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has made him to oppose his people, be patient against their harm and spent his wealth upon those who are need it among his brothers, the

believers! Abubakar has never harmed the Prophet (s.a.w) with all his seclusions and meetings with him during the day times and in the nights and he possessed the chances of a deceiver who want to poison his target or kill him or inflict him with any other form of harm! Furthermore, it is part of the protection of Allah to His Prophet (s.a.w) and guaranteeing his safety to inform him about bad people who are intending to harm him. Allah has informed him about the bad intention of Abu Izzat when he come to him feigning belief with the intention of harming him and that was in just one meeting. Allah also showed him the intention of Hujaibi on the day of the battle of Hunain, when the Muslims are initially defeated and he decided to harm him. Allah also revealed to him what is in the heart of Umair bin Wahab when he comes from Makka feigning Islam with the intention of harming him. Allah also revealed to him the plans of the hypocrites during the battle of Tabuk when they decided to untie the girdle of his Camel.

Abubakar is always with the Prophet (s.a.w) day and night and present with him at home and during travels and both when he is alone and in public. During the battle of Badr, he is the only person who stood with the Prophet (s.a.w) in his shade. Then how can he have a bad intention and the Prophet will never know that? Whoever has little intelligence will grasp and understand the person who hates him through fewer encounters. Can anybody possess this bad opinion concerning the Prophet (s.a.w) and Abubakar other than a person – who in addition to his extreme ignorance and perfect foolishness – who is the greatest in faulting the Prophet (s.a.w), disparaging him, and censuring his knowledge? If this ignorant man – in addition to all that has been mentioned – love the Prophet (s.a.w); then certainly, whoever has little experience with the religion of Islam, knew that the creed of Shia Rafidah is against Islam.

The Rafidi stated: “Wherever Allah mentioned sending down tranquility to the Prophet (s.a.w), He will associate him with the believers except in this place (verse) and this is a greatest defect (to Abubakar).”

We reply that: Firstly: This Rafidi is deceiving and deluding people to think that it was mentioned in many places in the Qur'an, while the reality contradicts his submission and statement. Nay, that was only mention on the story of the battle of Hunain, as Allah has said: **"Then Allah did send down His Sakinah (calmness, tranquility and reassurance, etc.) on the Messenger (Muhammad SAW), and on the believers, and sent down forces (angels) which you saw not, and punished the disbelievers. Such is the recompense of disbelievers"** (9:26). Thus, Allah mentioned sending down tranquility to His Messenger and the believers after mentioning that they fled from the battle ground (in the beginning). Allah has mentioned sending down tranquility to the believer without mentioning the Prophet (s.a.w): **"He it is Who sent down As-Sakinah (calmness and tranquillity) into the hearts of the believers, that they may grow more in Faith along with their (present) Faith. And to Allah belong the hosts of the heavens and the earth, and Allah is Ever All-Knower, All-Wise"** (48:4). And in the words of Allah the Most high: **"Indeed, Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave their Bai'a (pledge) to you (O Muhammad SAW) under the tree, He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down As-Sakinah (calmness and tranquility) upon them, and He rewarded them with a near victory"** (48:18),

Secondly: The Qur'an exegetist (interpreters) have differed on the referral of the personal pronoun of the word of Allah: **"Then Allah send down As-Sakinah (calmness and tranquility) upon him"** (9:40). Some of them said it is referring to the Prophet (s.a.w), while some of them said it is referring to Abubakar, because he is the closest person in mention (before the personal pronoun). And because he needed tranquility to be sent down to him and thus, it was sent to him, in the same way that it was sent to the believers who gave the Prophet (s.a.w) vow of allegiance under the tree at Hudaibiyyah. The prophet (s.a.w) is self-sufficient from requiring tranquility because of his perfect composure and certitude, in contrast to sending it down in Hunain, for at that time he needed it

because most of the companions have fled from the battlefield, the enemies are coming towards him and he is moving on his mule towards them. According to the first opinion the personal pronoun is referring to the Prophet (s.a.w), in similar manner that it referred to him in the words of Allah: “...**And strengthened him with forces (angels) which you saw not...**” (9:40). And because the context of the speech is on mentioning him (the Prophet) and his companion is only mentioned inclusively and as result of him. On the basis of this when he said to his companion: “**Certainly Allah is with us**” (9:40). Here the Prophet (s.a.w) is the obeyed leader and Abubakar is the obeying follower and Allah is with them (both of them). Therefore, tranquility and support are given to the leader in this condition, and they are also given to the follower by the verdict of situation. Certainly, he is his companion, follower and requisite, thus there is no need to mention Abubakar in this instance due to perfection of companionship and adherence that necessitated associating the Prophet (s.a.w) in support and aid of Allah.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITY OF THE RAFIDI THAT ABUBAKAR IS NOT THE MOST PIOUS

The Rafidi stated: The words of Allah: **“And the pious (and righteous) will be far removed from it (Hell)” (92:17)**. The verse is talking about Abu Dahdah, when he bought a date tree for his neighbor. The Prophet (s.a.w) has offered to the owner of the date tree recompense with a date tree in Paradise, but he refused. When Abu Dahdah heard the issue, he exchanged the date tree with his garden and gave it to the neighbor and the Prophet (s.a.w) promised him a replacement of his garden in Paradise.”

We reply that: It not permissible to make this verse specific to Abu Dahdah to the exclusion of Abubakar by the consensus of the scholars of Qur'an, its exegesis and reasons for revelations. This is because this Chapter of the Qur'an was revealed in Makka by the consensus of scholars and the story of Abu Dahdah took place in Madina by the consensus of scholars for he is a man among Ansar. The Ansar accompanied the Prophet (s.a.w) in Madina. The gardens that are called Hitan are situated in Madina and thus, it is impossible to say that the verse is not revealed but after the episode of Abu Dahdah. Nay, when some scholars said it was revealed concerning him, they mean by that statement, he is among those who are encompassed by the verse in terms of its general precepts and intendments. Certainly, many a time the Prophet's companions and the Tabi'un used to say: “This verse is revealed concerning so and so,” while what they mean by their statement is that it indicated this verdict. Among the scholars there are those who are saying a verse can be revealed twice; at a time for this reason and at another time for that reason. In accordance to this opinion, it might be that the verse was revealed again for the second time regarding the story of Abu Dahdah, otherwise there is no difference between scholars that it was revealed on Makka, before Abu Dahdah embraced Islam and before the Prophet (s.a.w) immigrated to Madina. Many among the scholars have mentioned that it was revealed concerning Abubakar among who is Ibn Jarir Tabari in his exegesis of the Qur'an, where he cited a hadith with its chain of authority to Abdullah bin Zubair and

other companions. It was also mentioned by Abu Hatim and Tha'alabi that it is revealed concerning Abubakar on the authority of Abdullah and Sa'id bin Musayyab.

Among the things that proved that it was revealed concerning Abubakar are the following: Firstly: Allah the Most High said: **“And the pious (and righteous) will be far removed from it (Hell)” (92:17).** And He also said: **“... Verily, the most honourable of you with Allah is that (believer) who has At-Taqwa (the most pious) ...” (49:13).** Therefore, the most pious person in the Islamic community is encompassed by this verse and he is the most honored among them to Allah. And nobody said: Abu Dahdah, and those similar to him are better and more honored than the first and the foremost Muhajirun.

Secondly: If he is the most pious, he is the one who is spending his wealth in order to increase in self-purification and the most honored to Allah is the most pious, and that is the best of men. There are two well-known opinions about this verse. The opinion of Ahlus Sunnah is that Abubakar is the best of people, while Shia believe that Ali is the best of people. Therefore, it is not permissible to have another person who is the most pious, who is also the most honorable to Allah, other than those two men and that none of them is encompassed by the word “the most pious.” If it is affirmed that one of them must be the most pious, it is necessary that that person is Abubakar; that the verse encompassed him and that he more deserved to be the most pious than Ali, due to many reasons among which are:

Firstly: Allah the Most high said: **“He who spends his wealth for increase in self-purification” (92:18).** It has been affirmed in concurrent hadiths, in the books of Sihah and other books of hadith, that Abubakar has spent his wealth for the sake of Allah and that he is foremost in this regard than all the Prophet's companions. With regard to Ali, it is the Prophet (s.a.w) who took care of him after taking him from Abu Talib due to famine and want that occurred in Makka, and he continued to be a poor man up to the time he married Fatima. This fact is well-known to Ahlus Sunnah and Shia. He is a

member of the Prophet's household but he does not possess money so that he can spend it on the path of Allah; if he has money he will spend it for Allah's sake; but the Prophet (s.a.w) used to spend on him and he does not spend.

Secondly: Allah the Most High said: **“And have in his mind no favor from anyone for which a reward is expected in return” (92:19).** This verse is for Abubakar to the exclusion of Ali for Abubakar has obtained the favor of belief from the Prophet (s.a.w) and human beings cannot repay that favor. Nay, the recompense of the Prophet (s.a.w) is with Allah, as He the most High has said: **“Say (O Muhammad): “No wage do I ask of you for this (the Quran), nor am I one of the Mutakallifun (those who pretend and fabricate things which do not exist)” (38:86).** He the Most high also said: **“Say (O Muhammad): “Whatever wage I might have asked of you is yours. My wage is from Allah only. And He is Witness over all things” (34:47).** The favor that can be repaid to human beings is the favor of this world and Abubakar do not acquire from the Prophet (s.a.w) the favor of this world. Nay, he got from him the favor of religion in contrast to Ali who acquired from Prophet (s.a.w) the favors of this world and which can be repaid (in kind).

Thirdly: There isn't any motive that necessitate Abubakar to love the Prophet (s.a.w) for its sake and to spend his wealth other than belief and faith. He did not supported him in the like manner that Abu Talib aided him due to kinship. Therefore, all his acts are solely and sincerely for the sake of Allah, as Allah the Most High has said: **“Except only the desire to seek the Countenance of his Lord, the Most High; He surely will be pleased (when he will enter Paradise)” (92:20-21).**

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITY OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING THE VERSE OF THOSE WHO LAGGED BEHIND

The Rafidi stated: With regard to the words of Allah: **“Say (O Muhammad SAW) to the Bedouins who lagged behind: ‘You shall be called to fight against a people given to great warfare, then you shall fight them, or they shall surrender. Then if you obey, Allah will give you a fair reward, but if you turn away as you did turn away before, He will punish you with a painful torment’”** (48:16). Allah means those who lagged behind concerning Hudaibiyyah and they sought to go after the war booties of Khaibar, but Allah prevented them with his words: **“... Say: “You shall not follow us...”** (48:15). This is because Allah has given the war booties of Khaibar to those who attended Hudaibiyyah. Then Allah said: **“Say (O Muhammad SAW) to the Bedouins who lagged behind: ‘You shall be called to fight against a people given to great warfare, then you shall fight them, or they shall surrender. Then if you obey, Allah will give you a fair reward, but if you turn away as you did turn away before, He will punish you with a painful torment’”** (48:16). The Prophet (s.a.w) has invited them to many battle such as Mu’atah, Hunain, Tabuk etc., and the person who invited them is the Prophet (s.a.w), and it is possible to say the one who invited them is Ali bin Abi Talib, because he fought those who withdrew their vows of allegiance, those who refused to give their vows of allegiance and those who dissented; their return to obeying him is returning to Islam, for the Prophet (s.a.w) said: “O Ali! Fighting you is fighting me,” and fighting the Prophet (s.a.w) is unbelief.”

We reply that: There are many scholars who used this verse to prove the Caliphate of Abubakar and the obligation of obeying him, among those scholars are Imam Shaifi’i, Imam ‘Ash’ari and Ibn Hazm etc., they support their evidence with the words of Allah: **“If Allah brings you back to a party of them (the hypocrites), and they ask your permission to go out (to fight), say: “Never shall you go out with**

me, nor fight an enemy with me; you agreed to sit inactive on the first occasion, then you sit (now) with those who lag behind” (9:83). They pointed out that Allah has commanded his Prophet (s.a.w) to tell those people that: You will never accompany me again and you will never fight an enemy with me again. Therefore, it is known that the one who will invite them to fight is not the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and thus, it is obligatory that the invitation will be after him. Nobody come after him other than Abubakar, then Umar and then Uthman, who invited people to fight against the Persians and the Romans and other communities or to make them to surrender, as Allah has said: “... **then you shall fight them, or they shall surrender...**” (48:16).

The area of proving in this verse is: “... **then you shall fight them, or they shall surrender...**” (48:16). This means that they are characterized by great warfare and they will be fought or they surrender. They (the scholars) stated: It is not permissible to say that he (the prophet) invited them to fight the people of Makka and Hawazin after the year of conquest of Makka, because they are the same people who are invited in the year of Hudaibiyyah and whoever is not among them is of their class and thus, he is not greater than them in warfare. They are all Arabs from the Arabian Peninsula and their method of fighting is the same. The people of Makka and its environs used to display great warfare than those people and they fought the Prophet (s.a.w) and his companions during the battles of Badr, Uhud and the Ditch (confederates) and other detachments.

What the Rafidi mentioned in the narration that: “Fighting you is fighting me,” he did not mention for it any chain of authority and thus, it is not a proof or evidence. How is it with you, when you find out that it is a fabricated lie by the consensus of scholars of hadith and its sciences?

The Rafidi stated: “It is possible that the person who invited is Ali (to the exclusion of the first three caliphs) because he fought those who withdrew their vows of allegiance, those who refused to give their

vows of allegiance and those who dissent.” – He means the people of the Camel, Siffin and the Kharijites.

We reply that: This is absolutely false from many perspectives:

Firstly: Those people are not a people given to great warfare than their class; it is well known that those who fought him in the battle of Camel are less than his men for his army was greater than them. The same thing can be said concerning the Kharijites for his army are greater than them manifolds. His army are also greater than those at Siffin and they are of the same stock and class; there is nothing in describing them as men of great warfare which shows that they are better than others.

It is well known that the Banu Hanifa, the Persians and the Romans are greater in warfare than all those groups by very far measure and standard. There is nothing that occurred among those who Ali fought of intensity of slaying as has happened to the army of Abubakar who fought the followers of Musailamah the liar. It is well known to every man of intellect that fighting the Persians and the Romans is greater warfare than fighting the Muslims, Arabs between themselves, even though fighting the unbelievers in the beginning of Islam is greater. That is due to the little population of believers and their weakness in the beginning of Islam and not because their enemies are greater in warfare than the Persians and the Romans.

Secondly: Ali did not invite people far away from him to come and fight the people of Camel and the Kharijites with him. When he arrived at Basrah he has no intention of fighting anybody but fighting occurred with neither his choice, nor the choice of Talha and Zubair. With regard to the Kharijites, a section of his army is enough to deal with them and thus, he did not invite anybody from the Bedouins of the Arabian Peninsula to come and aid him in fighting them.

Thirdly: If it is assumed that it is obligatory to obey Ali in fighting those people; it is impossible to think that Allah has commanded fighting Muslims in order to make them obey the man in charge with authority and He will not command fighting unbelievers to believe in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w). It is well known that those who

refused to obey Ali are not the farthest people from belief in Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) than those who denied belief in the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and the Qur'an and he never accept anything among what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) brought from his Lord. Nay, these people are greater sinners and thus, inviting them to Islam is better and fighting them is the best, if we assume that those who fought Ali are unbelievers.

If it is said: They are apostates, as is the belief of Shia Rafidah. We say: It is well known that the apostasy of a person who believe in another prophet other than Muhammad (s.a.w) such as Musailamah the liar, is a greater apostasy than that of a person who refused to obey a leader although he is a believer in the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w).

Under all conditions and considerations, you will not mention the sins of those who fought Ali, but you will find that the sins of those who fought the three Caliphs are greater and there will be no mention of virtue and recompense of those who fought on the side of Ali, but the virtues and recompense of those who fought with the three Caliphs are greater. We are making these comparisons on the assumptions that those who fought Ali are unbelievers. It is well known that this statement is false for nobody is making it except the worthless among the Shia, otherwise the rational sane men among them are not saying that. We concurrently knew from Ali and the members of his household and progeny that they never ascribe those who fought Ali to apostasy. [\[223\]](#)

We are making these thesis under the assumption that this fighting is something commanded by Allah! Then how about if we knew that the Prophet's companions (s.a.w) and the scholars have differed on it: Is it fighting out-laws which is hinged upon the condition that they started the fight or the fighting is not of this type due to the condition upon which it is hinged? The opinion of the grand companions and the Tabi'un is that the battles of the Camel and Siffin are not among the fighting that are commanded by Allah, and that abandoning them is better than participating in them. Nay, they counted them among

fighting in trial and tribulation (Fitnah). This is the opinion of the generality of scholars of hadith and the generality of the jurists.

Fourthly: This verse absolutely, do not encompass fighting with Ali, because Allah said: **“You shall fight them or they surrender...” (48:16)**. Therefore, Allah has decreed that one of the two things must occur: Fighting or embracing Islam.^[224] It is well known that most of those who Ali invited never fight him, but they abandoned the fighting; they did not fight him and they did not fight against him thereby forming a third group; they did not fight him, they did not fight on his side and they did not obey him; and they are all Muslims. The Qur'an, the Sunnah and the consensus of the companions etc., have proved that they are all Muslims. Allah the Most High said: **“And if two parties or groups among the believers fall to fighting, then make peace between them both, but if one of them rebels against the other, then fight you (all) against the one that which rebels till it complies with the Command of Allah; then if it complies, then make reconciliation between them justly, and be equitable. Verily! Allah loves those who are equitable” (49:9)**. Therefore, Allah described them as believers with fighting and rebellion and He informed that they are brothers. And we knew that brotherhood can only be between believers and not between a believer and an unbeliever.

With regard to ascribing them to apostasy by the Rafidi and his making their return to obeying Ali as returning to Islam (after apostasy) when he cited the fabricated hadith: “O Ali! Fighting you is fighting me.”

We reply that: It is among the surprising things and the greatest calamities that those people who have been forsaken by Allah (and defeated by the believers) are trying to affirm this grand principle with hadith that do not exist in reliable compendiums of hadith. You can neither find it in the Sihah, nor in the Masanids, nor in the Fawa'id and certainly not in any other book that has been transmitted by scholars of hadith and which they study and transfer between themselves. This hadith, by the consensus of scholars of hadith is neither sound, nor good, nor weak, nay it is lesser than that;

it is apparently a fabricated lie. It is certainly in contrast to known concurrent Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) in which he said that the two groups are Muslims, he stated that abandoning fighting in that Fitnah (tribulation) is better than getting involved in it and he praised the person who bring about peace between the two parties of Muslims.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITIES OF THE RAFIDI ON THE VIRTUES OF ABUBAKAR ON THE DAY OF BADR

The Rafidi stated: “With regard to his (Abubakar) being his (the Prophet) companion in the shed during the battle of Badr; there is no virtue in it. This is because Allah suffices his Prophet (s.a.w) as an intimate companion from the need for any other companion. But since the Prophet (s.a.w) knew that if he allowed Abubakar to participate in the fighting it will lead to evil consequences, because he has run away from many battle fields. Which of these two things is better: Sitting down in the shed or entering the battle field and fighting in the cause of Allah?”

We reply that: We say to this slanderer, liar, what you have mentioned is the most apparent falsehood from many perspectives:

Firstly: The Rafidi stated: “He run away many times from the battle fields.” We reply that: This statement indicated that the person who made it is one of the most ignorant men concerning the battles of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his history. This kind of ignorance cannot be objected against the Shia Rafida for they are the most ignorant people about the history of the Prophet (s.a.w), the greatest people in accepting falsehood and the greatest people that denies the truth. This is because the battle of Badr is the first war that has been fought between the Muslims and the polytheists and before its occurrence absolutely no battle has been fought; neither by the Prophet (s.a.w), nor by Abubakar.

Secondly: Abubakar has never fled from the battlefield, even on the day of Uhud, he and Umar never fled the battlefield, but Uthman has fled and he is among those who Allah has forgiven. Certainly, nobody has reported that Abubakar and Umar have ever fled from a battle. Nobody ever say: They run away with those who run away, not even on the day of Hunain for they remained steadfast with the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and this has been explained by historians.

Thirdly: If he has such extreme, cowardice the Prophet (s.a.w) will not chose him from all his companions to be with him in his shed. Nay, it is not permissible for the leader to take as a companion a deserter or an agitated, convulsive trembler (with him to a war), let alone preferring him over all his companions and asking him to stay with him in his shed (which is the command post).

Fourthly: Everybody that has knowledge of history of the Prophet (s.a.w) and his companions, knew that Abubakar has stronger heart than all of them. Certainly, since Allah sent Muhammad (s.a.w) as His Prophet to the time he died, Abubakar continued to be a fighter in the cause of Allah, steadfast, daring, fearless, courageous, and brave. It is never known that he behave cowardly towards fighting the enemy. Nay, when the Prophet (s.a.w) died the heart of most of the companions become weak and he is the one who continued to encourage them, arouse them and make them remain steadfast to the extent that Anas said: ***“Abubakar delivered sermon to us at a moment when we are like foxes and he continued to encourage us until we become like lions.”*** It was narrated that Umar said to him: ***“O successor of the Messenger of Allah! Attract their hearts gently (Meaning apostates and those who refuses to pay Zakat etc.)! Abubakar took hold of his beard and say to him: Ó son of Khattab! Are you a giant before Islam and a coward in Islam? On what shall I attract their hearts gently; on a fabricated statement or a created poem (meaning the holy book of Musailamah the liar)?***

Fifthly: The Rafidi stated: “Which of this two things is better: Sitting down in the shed or entering the battle field and fighting in the cause of Allah?”

We reply that: Nay, his being with this Prophet (s.a.w) in this condition is better than being in the battlefield fighting. The main target and goal of the polytheists is to kill the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). That is why one third of the army stood around him in order to guard and protect him, a third of the army chased those who fled and another third of the army gathered and collected the war booties and thereafter Allah divided the booties between them.

Sixthly: The Rafidi stated: "Certainly, the companionship of Allah suffices the Prophet (s.a.w) from any other companionship."

We reply that: "It is not an expression of the Qur'an to say that he is keeping the Prophet company in the shed. Nobody say that the Prophet (s.a.w) is feeling some strangeness (or loneliness) and therefore he needs somebody who will be with him, talk to him, and make him happy. Nay, what is meant is that he is aiding him in the fight (with advice and strategy). The virtues of Abubakar are exclusive to him, nobody share them with him and the virtues of Ali are communal virtues; they are shared by the rest of the companions.

Seventhly: Certainly, the prophet (s.a.w) and Abubakar left the shed and the Prophet (s.a.w) threw a handful of sand to them (the polytheists), Allah said concerning that: **"You killed them not, but Allah killed them. And you (Muhammad) threw not when you did throw but Allah threw, that He might test the believers by a fair trial from Him. Verily, Allah is All-Hearer, All-Knower" (8:16).** And Abubakar fought them to the extent that his son Abdurrahman said to him: "I saw you during the battle of Badr and I avoided you. He replied to him saying: "If I have seen you, I will have killed you."

SEGMENT: REMOVING THE AMBIGUITIES OF THE RAFID ON THE SPENDINGS OF THE ABUBAKAR ON THE PROPHET

The Rafidi stated: “His spending on the Prophet (s.a.w) is a lie, because he is not wealthy. Certainly, his father was very poor to the extent that he is every day given some measure of foodstuffs by Abdullah bin Jud’an. If Abubakar is rich he would have suffices him. He was a teacher of children before Islam and he was a tailor during the period of Islam. When he became the Caliph they prevented him from tailoring and he said: “I need to earn my daily bread.” Thus, they made for him a salary of three Dirham daily from the public treasury.”

We reply that: It is of the greatest slander and injustice for a man to deny what is concurrently reported and what is well-known by both the special and the generality of the people. It is a fact that has been recorded in all the books; the books of hadith such as Sihah and Masanid, the books of the exegesis of the Qur’an and jurisprudence and the books that have been written on their history, biographies and virtues. Thereafter, he will claim some narrations that are not known but through his expression. He never transmits it with any known chain of authority and he never ascribes it to any known, reliable book. He never mentions the person who made the statement. If we assume that the person who is debating him is the most ignorant man, he would have said to him: What you have mentioned is a lie and what your opponents say is the truth. How can you state a thing that has nothing absolutely to support it and without any known, identifiable transmitted hadith? Who has mentioned what he has stated concerning Abubakar among reliable scholars?

Furthermore, that Abubakar has spent his wealth on the Prophet (s.a.w) is a concurrently transmitted issue. It comes in many sound hadiths and from many sources that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: “... ***The person who has favored me most of all both with his company and wealth, is Abu Bakr. If I were to take a Khalil other***

than my Lord, I would have taken Abu Bakr as such, but (what relates us) is the Islamic brotherhood and friendliness. All the gates of the Mosque should be closed except the gate of Abu Bakr” (Bukhari).

It also come in sound hadith on the authority of Aisha that: ***“When the Muslims were put to test (i.e. troubled by the pagans), Abubakar set out migrating to the land of Ethiopia, and when he reached Bark-al-Ghimad, Ibn Ad-Daghina, the chief of the tribe of Qara, met him and said, "O Abubakar! Where are you going?" Abubakar replied, "My people have turned me out (of my country), so I want to wander on the earth and worship my Lord." Ibn Ad-Daghina said, "O Abubakar! A man like you should not leave his home-land, nor should he be driven out, because you help the destitute, earn their livings, and you keep good relations with your Kith and kin, help the weak and poor, entertain guests generously, and help the calamity-stricken persons. Therefore I am your protector. Go back and worship your Lord in your town” (Bukhari).***

In another sound hadith which come concerning the slander against Aisha it is narrated that: ***“Allah revealed those Quranic Verses to declare my innocence. Abubakar As-Siddiq who used to disburse money for Mistah bin Uthatha because of his relationship to him and his poverty, said, 'By Allah, I will never give to Mistah bin Uthatha anything after what he has said about Aisha.' Then Allah revealed:-- "And let not those among you who are good and wealthy swear not to give (any sort of help) to their kinsmen, those in need, and those who have left their homes for Allah's cause, let them pardon and forgive. Do you not love that Allah should forgive you? And Allah is oft-Forgiving Most Merciful" (24.22). Abubakar As-Siddiq said, 'Yes, by Allah, I would like that Allah forgive me.' and went on giving Mistah the money he used to give him before. He also added, 'By Allah, I will never deprive him of it at all” (Bukhari).*** All these proved that Abubakar is a rich man both before and after Islam.

It is confirmed that he bought those who are being tortured with his wealth (and freed them for the sake of Allah), such as Bilal and 'Amir bin Fuhairah; he brought seven souls (and freed them from bondage in Makka).

The Rafidi stated: "Certainly, his father was very poor to the extent that he is every day given some measure of foodstuffs by Abdullah bin Jud'an."

We reply that: He did not mention a chain of authority by which its soundness can be known and even if this statement is sound it does not harm Abubakar for it might have happened before the advent of Islam. Certainly, Abdullah bin Jud'an died before the advent of Islam. After the advent of Islam, the father of Abubakar has sufficient provisions. It is never known that his father is a beggar going around begging people and he outlived his son Abubakar. When one sixth of the inheritance of his deceased son was given to him, he returned it to his children because he is self-sufficient.

The Rafidi stated: "Abubakar was a teacher of children before Islam." We reply that: If this statement is true, it is not blameworthy to be a teacher and being a teacher does not harm him. Nay, it showed that he has some knowledge and science. Certainly, the statement of Shia Rafidah is like the statement of the ignorant polytheists who display partisanship for kinship and parents and not religion. They censure a person with what does not reduce his belief or fear of Allah; all these are among the acts of ignorance and that is why ignorance is very clear in their actions. They are similar to unbelievers in all the areas that they contradicted men of faith and religion.

The Rafidi stated: "Abubakar was a tailor during the era of Islam and when he becomes the Caliph, they prevented him from tailoring."

We reply that: This is a clear lie, even though it is not blameworthy to be a tailor, if the statement is true. Abubakar was not a tailor but a merchant. Sometimes he travels for his business transactions. He has travelled to Syria due to his merchandize during the era of Islam. Merchandize is the best occupation of the Quraish and the richest

among them are merchants. When he becomes the Caliph, he wanted to continue with his business so that he can take care of his family but the Muslims prevented him, saying: "This will take you away from taking care of the welfare and well-being of the Muslims."

The Rafidi stated: "Before immigration the Prophet is well provided for with the wealth of Khadijah and there is no need to finance any war."

We reply that: The spending of Abubakar are not on the person of the Prophet (s.a.w), on feeding him or clothing him, for Allah has sufficed His messenger (s.a.w) from the need for the wealth of all people. Nay, his aiding and spending on the Prophet (s.a.w) is on establishing Islam and faith. His spending is in the areas that Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w) loves and not on the person of the Prophet (s.a.w). Abubakar bought those who are being oppressed and tortured because of their religion such as Bilal, 'Amir bin Fuhairah, Zannirah and a host of other men.

The Rafidi stated: "After the immigration to Madina, he absolutely possess nothing."

We reply that: This is a clear lie. Nay, he used to aid the Prophet (s.a.w) with his wealth. The Prophet (s.a.w) once urged his companions to give out in charity to the needy and Abubakar brought all his wealth to him. Narrated Abu 'Uthman: 'Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr said, ***"The Suffa Companions were poor people and the Prophet said, 'Whoever has food for two persons should take a third one from them (Suffa companions). And whosoever has food for four persons he should take one or two from them' Abubakar took three men and the Prophet took ten of them" (Buhkari).***

The Rafidi stated: "If he has spent on the Prophet (s.a.w) it is obligatory to reveal it in the Qur'an, in the same manner that Chapter Seventy Six (76) of the Qur'an was revealed concerning Ali?"

We reply that: The scholars of hadith has had consensus that the claimed revelation of Chapter Seventy Six (Insan) of the Qur'an concerning Ali is a fabricated lie. Those exegetists of the Qur'an

whose custom is to cite fabricated hadiths mentioned the narration. The proof of its being a fabricated lie is very clear. Certainly, the Chapter Insan was revealed in Makka and thus, it is Makkan Chapter. It was revealed before immigration to Madina and before Ali married Fatima and the begetting of Hasan and Husain. This case has been treated in another place in details. Absolutely, no text has been revealed specifically concerning Ali's spending on charity. This is because he does not possess wealth. Nay, before immigration to Madina, he is part of the family of the Prophet (s.a.w) and after the immigration he used to offer his labor for payment. When he married Fatima, he does not possess dowry except his shield. He was able to spend money on the marriage out of his share of the booty from the battle of Badr.

With regard to Abubakar, he is the first person intended with all the verses concerning those who spent their wealth in the path of Allah in the Islamic community. Such as the words of Allah the Most High: **“And what is the matter with you that you spend not in the Cause of Allah? And to Allah belongs the heritage of the heavens and the earth. Not equal among you are those who spent and fought before the conquering (of Makkah) (with those among you who did so later). Such are higher in degree than those who spent and fought afterwards. But to all, Allah has promised the best (reward). And Allah is All-Aware of what you do” (57:10).** Abubakar is one of those people and the foremost among them. The same thing with the words of Allah: **“And the most pious will be far removed from it (Hell). He who spends his wealth for increase in self-purification” (92:17-18).** Exegetists of the Qur'an such as Tabari mentioned that Abdurrahman bin Abu Hatim etc., with their chain of authority to Urwah bin Zubair, Abdullah bin Zubair, Sa'id bin Musayyaib etc.; stated that it was revealed concerning Abubakar.

SEGMENT: NULLIFYING THE AMBIGUITY OF THE RAFIDI CONCERNING FORWARDING ABUBAKAR TO LEAD PRAYER

The Rafidi stated: "Forwarding him to lead prayer was a mistake, because when Bilal called for prayer, Aisha commanded him to forward Abubakar and when the Prophet (s.a.w) regained consciousness, he head the Takbir. He asked: "who is leading people in prayer?' they replied: 'Abubakar!" He said: "Take me out." So he went out reclining on Ali and Abbas, pushed him away from the direction of prayer, removing him from leading the prayer and he led people in prayer by himself."

We reply that: This is a well known lie to all scholars of hadith. Firstly: Who has transmitted what you have mentioned with sound reliable, chain of authority? This type of thing can only be found in the books of Shia Rafidah without any chain of authority. The Shia Rafidah are the greatest liars and the most ignorant men with the condition, history, conducts, statements and acts of the Prophet (s.a.w); such as Mufid bin Nu'uman, Karrajiki and those similar to them, who are the farthest away men from having knowledge of the conditions of the Prophet (s.a.w), his statement and acts.

Secondly: This is the statement of the ignorant who think that Abubakar led people in prayers just one time. Those endowed with knowledge knew that he continued praying with them up to the time the Prophet (s.a.w) died, by his permission, command and his successorship, after Aisha and Hafsa asked him to appoint Umar instead. It come in a sound hadith that: Yahya related to me from Malik from Hisham ibn Urwa from his father from A'isha, the wife of the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, ***that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said, "Tell Abubakar to lead the people in prayer." Aisha said, "Messenger of Allah, when Abubakar stands in your place his voice does not reach the ears of the people because of his weeping, so tell Umar to lead the people in prayer." He said, "Tell Abubakar to lead the people in prayer." Aisha continued, "I***

told Hafsa to tell him that when Abubakar stood in his place his voice did not reach the ears of the people because of his weeping, and that he should tell Umar to lead the people in prayer. Hafsa did so, and the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, said, 'You are the companions of Yusuf! (referring to the women who cut their hands when they saw the beauty of Yusuf). Tell Abubakar to lead the people in prayer!' Aisha added that Hafsa said to her, "I have never had anything good from you!"(Malik, Bukhari).

In another hadith Narrated 'Aisha: When Allah's Apostle became seriously ill, Bilal came to him for the prayer. He said, "Tell Abubakar to lead the people in the prayer." I said, "O Allah's Apostle! Abubakar is a soft-hearted man and if he stands in your place, he would not be able to make the people hear him. Will you order 'Umar (to lead the prayer)?" The Prophet said, "Tell Abubakar to lead the people in the prayer." Then I said to Hafsa, "Tell him, Abubakar is a soft-hearted man and if he stands in his place, he would not be able to make the people hear him. Would you order 'Umar to lead the prayer?' "Hafsa did so. The Prophet said, "Verily you are the companions of Joseph. Tell Abubakar to lead the people in the prayer." So Abubakar stood for the prayer. In the meantime Allah's Apostle felt better and came out with the help of two persons and both of his legs were dragging on the ground till he entered the mosque. When Abubakar heard him coming, he tried to retreat but Allah's Apostle beckoned him to carry on. The Prophet sat on his left side. Abubakar was praying while standing and Allah's Apostle was leading the prayer while sitting. Abubakar was following the Prophet and the people were following Abubakar (in the prayer)" (Muslim). [\[225\]](#)

Therefore, Abubakar led prayer for a number of days before the Prophet (s.a.w) died. In the beginning of the affair, the Prophet (s.a.w) sent many messages to Abubakar commanding him to lead people in prayer. Aisha is not the person who informed Abubakar to lead people in prayer and she never informed her father that the

Prophet (s.a.w) has commanded him to lead prayer as claimed by those Rafidah, the slanderers, the liars.

Those liars stated that: “After Bilal has called for prayer, Aisha commanded him to forward Abubakar to lead the people in prayer.”

We reply that: This is a very clear lie. Aisha never commanded him to forward Abubakar to lead prayer, she never commanded him anything, and Bilal never take any directive from her. Bilal come and informed the Prophet (s.a.w) that it is time for prayer, and the Prophet (s.a.w) said to him and all those present: ***“Ask Abubakar to lead people in prayer.”*** Thus, he never specifically give Aisha the command and Bilal did not hear that command from her.

The Rafidi stated: “When he regained consciousness, he heard the Takbir (the saying: Allah is greater) and asked: ‘Who is leading people in prayer?’ They replied: ‘Abubakar.’ He said: ‘take me out...’”

We reply that: This is a lie that is very clear. It has been affirmed by concurrent narrations, which all scholars agreed upon its reliability, and soundness that: Certainly, Abubakar has been leading them in prayers for many days before he come out. He also continued leading them in prayers for many days after he come out and that throughout the period of his illness, it is only Abubakar who led them in prayer.

Furthermore, it is well known concurrently that the Prophet (s.a.w) was sick for many days and during that period he was not able to lead them in prayers for many days. Who is the person leading them in prayers throughout that period? Nobody has ever transmitted – neither a truthful person nor a liar – that anybody other than Abubakar has led them in prayer; neither Umar nor Ali, nor any other person! They have prayed congregational prayers (throughout that period) and thus, it is known that the only person who has been leading them in prayers is Abubakar. It is impossible to say that the Prophet (s.a.w) is unaware about that and that the Muslims have not sought his consent concerning him, for surely that type of conduct is impossible by law and tradition. Therefore, it is known that his leading them in prayer is with his permission. And Allah knows best.

O Allah! Send Your blessings to Your slave and Messenger, Muhammad and His family and wives. O Allah! Be pleased with Abubakar, Umar and all the companions of Your Prophet and send to them Your most perfect greetings and the best of blessings. May Allah raise us in their company! Amen.

EPILOGUE: THE NEED TO PROTECT ONESELF, FAMILY, AND SOCIETY FROM DEVIANT SECTS

“O you who believe! Ward off from yourselves and your families a Fire (Hell) whose fuel is men and stones, over which are (appointed) angels stern (and) severe, who disobey not, (from executing) the Commands they receive from Allah, but do that which they are commanded” (66:6). [\[226\]](#)

It is pertinent to mention some mistakes that derail people from the right path; the first of which is over trusting an individual, organization, a sect or a nation. This tendency is the tendency of the weak and the ignorant for they tend to judge the truth by the standard of those they assumed to profess it, instead of judging those who claimed to profess the truth by the standard of the truth. This is wrong for in this case and similar cases the liberal minded and people of intellect shall be guided by the gauge placed by Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a) when he said: ***“Do not seek for the truth by means of men; find first the truth and then you will recognize those who follows it.”*** Thus to know the truth you should not depend on any individual or organization, or sect or nation to be giving you handouts on what he or it or they think that is the truth; you must make effort to find it and that could be by leaning and studying books on comparative creeds with the intent of looking for the truth away from sentiments and by comparing all statements with the Qur'an and WASsound Sunnah throwing away whatever contradicts them. The second mistake and danger according to Imam Ghazali are: “When for instance, we read the treatises of the ‘brothers of purity’ and works of the same kind (i.e. books of Shia Imamiyyah, Rafida), we find in them sentences spoken by the Prophet (s.a.w) and quotations from the Sufis (or scholars or Imams). We approve these works; we give them our confidence; and we finish by accepting the errors which they contain, because of the good opinion of them which they have inspired us at the outset. Thus, by insensible degrees, we are led astray. In view of this danger the reading of philosophical writings (and those of other deviant sects) should be

forbidden, just as the slippery banks of a river are forbidden to one who knows not how to swim. The perusal of these false teachings must be prevented just as one prevents children from touching serpents. A snake-charmer himself will abstain from touching snakes in the presence of his young child, because he knows that the child, believing himself as clever as his father, will not fail to imitate him; and in order to lend him more weight to his prohibition the charmer will not touch a serpent under the eyes of his son.

Such should be the conduct of a learned man who is also wise. But the snake – charmer, after having taken the serpent and separated the venom from the antidote, having put the latter on one side and destroyed the venom, ought not to withhold the antidote from those who need it. In the same way a the skilled coin – assayer, after having investigating the bag of the false coiner, taken out the good coins and thrown away the bad ones, ought not to refuse the good to those who need and ask for it. Such should be the conduct of the learned man. If the patient feels a certain dislike of the antidote because he knows that it has been taken from a snake whose body is the receptacle of poison, he shall be disabused of his fallacy. If a beggar hesitates to take a piece of gold from a false coiner, he should be told that his hesitation is a pure mistake which will deprive him of the advantage which he seeks. It should be proved to him that the contact of the good coin with the bad does not injure the former and does not improve the latter. In the same way the contact of truth with falsehood does not change truth into falsehood, anymore than it changes falsehood into the truth.”

Imam Ghazali further stated: “This is the procedure followed by a wise man. Once in possession of the truth he examine the basis of various doctrines which come before him, and when he found them true, he accepts them without troubling himself whether the person who teaches them is sincere or a deceiver. Much rather, remembering how gold is buried in the bowels of the earth, the endeavor to disengage the truth from the mass of errors in which it is engulfed. The skilled coin – assayer plunges without hesitation his hand into the purse of the coiner of false money, and relying on

experience, separates good coins from bad. It is the ignorant rustic, and not the experienced assayer, who will ask why we should have anything to do with a false coiner. The unskilled swimmer must be kept away from the sea shore, not the experienced in diving. The child not the charmer must be forbidden to handle serpents. As a matter of fact, men have much a good opinion about themselves, of their mental superiority and intellectual depth; they believe themselves so skilled in discerning the true from the false, the path of safety from those of error, that they should be forbidden as much as possible the perusal of philosophical (and other deviant sects) writings, for though they sometimes escape the danger just pointed out, they cannot avoid that which we are about to indicate...”

A questioner asked Sheihk Muhammad Salih Munajjid on the website, www.islamqa.net: How can a person protect himself from fitnah (trials, temptation) with regard to his religious commitment? If he falls into that, what must he do to ward off this fitnah from himself? And the Sheikh replied as follows:

Firstly: The soundness of a person’s religious commitment in this world means happiness and triumph in the Hereafter. The capital of the Muslim is his religious commitment, so whoever neglects it and exposes it to trials and temptations is doomed to failure, whereas the one who preserves it and takes care to strengthen it will prosper and succeed. Therefore, one of the supplications of the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) was: **“O Allah, set right for me my religious commitment, which is the safeguard of my affairs. Set right for me my worldly affairs in which is my living. Set right for me my Hereafter in which will be my final abode. Make this life a means of increase in all that is good, and make death a relief for me from all evil” (Muslim).**

Imam Al-Mannawi said: “O Allah, set right for me my religious commitment, which is the safeguard of my affairs” means: it is what protects all my affairs, for if a person’s religious commitment is spoiled, all his affairs will be spoiled and he will be doomed to failure in this world and the Hereafter. (Fayd al-Qadeer, vol. 2, pg. 173).

Secondly: The Muslim – with the help of Allah – can protect his religious commitment from trials and temptations, by following the path of the believers with regard to what they were enjoined to adhere to. That includes the following:

1. Keeping away from any environment that will corrupt one's religious commitment and morals. So he should avoid living in the lands of kufr, and avoid mixing with the evildoers. Whoever keeps away from anything that may lead to corruption will protect his religious commitment from being lost, by Allah's leave. It is almost certain that living in environments of kufr and mixing with disbelievers will have an impact on the Muslim who dwells among them. We have seen and heard shocking stories of those who drifted away and sold their religious commitment for some fleeting worldly gain. That was because of being so dazzled and impressed by the environment of kufr and the disbelievers, and because of hearts becoming spiritually dead as a result of living among them or mixing with them.

The same may be said with regard to keeping away from any involvement in the battles between Muslims over controversial issues, especially when arguing about those differences leads to boycotting one another, turning their backs on one another and fighting. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyah said in Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyyah (vo. 4, pg. 410): "Whoever examines the stories of turmoil and arguments that take place among Muslims will realise that no Muslim ever got involved in that and was happy with the consequences of his involvement, because of what may happen to him of harm affecting his religious commitment and his worldly interests. Therefore, it is something to be forbidden, and refraining from it is something to be enjoined, concerning which Allah says (interpretation of the meaning): **"And let those who oppose the Messenger's (Muhammad)) commandment (i.e. his Sunnah—legal ways, orders, acts of worship, statements) (among the sects) beware, lest some Fitnah (disbelief, trials, afflictions, earthquakes, killing, overpowered by a tyrant) should befall them or a painful torment be inflicted on them"** (24:63).

2. Another thing that may help the Muslim to protect his religious commitment is strengthening his faith, by doing obligatory acts of obedience and refraining from that which is forbidden and prohibited. One of the greatest obligatory acts of obedience is prayer, so the Muslim should pray regularly and on time, fulfilling all the necessary conditions and doing all the obligatory parts of prayer, with proper humility and focus. Allah, may He be exalted, says (interpretation of the meaning): **“And perform As-Salât (Iqamât-as-Salât). Verily, As-Salât (the prayer) prevents from Al-Fahshâ' (i.e. great sins of every kind, unlawful sexual intercourse) and Al-Munkar (i.e. disbelief, polytheism, and every kind of evil wicked deed)” (29:45).**

The Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) enjoined doing all kinds of acts of obedience and worship in order to be saved from trials and temptations with regard to one's religious commitment, and he warned against worldly temptations such as wealth, women and status, lest they be the cause of selling one's religious commitment for their sake. He stated that a man may be a Muslim during the night then end up apostatising during the day, or he may be a Muslim during the day then end up apostatising during the night! It was narrated from Abu Hurairah that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: ***“Hasten to do good deeds before there emerges fitnah like a piece of black night, when a man will be a believer in the morning and a disbeliever in the evening, or he will be a believer in the evening and a disbeliever in the morning, and he will sell his religion for worldly gain” (Muslim).*** Shaikh Muhammad ibn Salih al-'Uthaimeen said: The point is that the Messenger (s.a.w) warned us against these trials that would be like a piece of black night, in which a person would be a believer in the morning and a disbeliever in the evening – Allah forbid; in a single day he would apostatise from Islam and exit the faith, he would be a believer in the morning and a disbeliever in the evening – we ask Allah to keep us safe and sound – and why would that be so? Because he would sell his religious commitment for worldly gain. Do not think that what is meant by worldly gain is merely wealth, for

every worldly pleasure is worldly gain, whether it is wealth, status, leadership, women, or anything else. Every worldly pleasure comes under the heading of worldly gain. These people who will be believers in the morning and disbelievers in the evening, or will be believers in the evening and become disbelievers in the morning – all of them will sell their religious commitment for some worldly gain. We ask Allah to protect us and you from trials and temptations. You should constantly seek refuge with Allah from trials and temptations (Sharh Riyadh as-Saliheen, vol. 2, pg. 20).

3. Supplication (du'a): Our Lord, may He be exalted, has guided us, and our Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) has taught us concise supplications that are of benefit to the one who wants to protect his religious commitment from trials and temptations. These supplications include: The phrase **“Guide us to the Straight Path”** in every rak'ah (unit of prayer); and the supplication of the Prophet (s.a.w): ***“O Allah, guide me among those whom You have guided, pardon me among those whom You have pardoned, turn to me in friendship among those on whom You have turned in friendship, and bless me in what You have bestowed, and save me from the evil of what You have decreed...”*** (Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud). This is what the Muslim says in Qunut al-Witr and in many other situations, because it includes seeking the help of Allah, may He be exalted, to guide the worshipper to the path of Islam and the straight path, and to make him steadfast in adhering to that, and to show him the best and shortest way of attaining His pleasure.

4. Keeping away from bad company: It was narrated from Abu Hurayrah that the Prophet (s.a.w) said: ***“A man will follow the way of his close friend, so let one of you look at who he takes as a close friend”*** (Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi). Do not take anyone as a close friend except one who is pleasing in terms of his religious commitment and honesty, for if you take him as a close friend, he will lead you to his religion and his way. So do not take risks with regard to your religious commitment or gamble with your soul by taking as a

close friend someone who is not pleasing in terms of his religious commitment and his way (Al-'Izlah, pg. 141).

5. Learn Islamic knowledge and consult trustworthy scholars: One of the greatest means by which a Muslim may ward off trials and confusion with regard to his religious commitment is Islamic knowledge. Therefore the ignorant person is more prone to drifting away from the right path of Islam. Look at those who circumambulate graves, or believe that the dead have the power to bring benefit or cause harm. If you reflect on the situation, you will see that they are ignorant people, and whoever among them has any knowledge is one of those who has sold his religious commitment in order to attain some fleeting worldly gain.

Thirdly: If anyone has fallen into any kind of temptation with regard to his religious commitment:

1. Let him hasten to get out of it and free himself from it completely, by repenting sincerely to Allah, may He be exalted, regretting his neglect of his duty towards Him, and resolving never to go back to it again.

2. Let him change his environment for one that is pure and wholesome.

3. Let him call upon his Lord, may He be exalted – with the utmost sincerity – and ask Him to save him from that.

4. Let him follow it with righteous deeds, and do a lot of them, as much as he can. Allah, may He be exalted, says (interpretation of the meaning): **“And perform As-Salât (Iqâmat-as-Salât), at the two ends of the day and in some hours of the night [i.e. the five compulsory Salât (prayers)]. Verily, the good deeds remove the evil deeds (i.e. small sins). That is a reminder (an advice) for the mindful (those who accept advice). And be patient; verily, Allâh wastes not the reward of the good-doers” (11:114-115).**

5. Reading biographies of righteous people among The Prophet's companions, the Tabi'un, the scholars, the ascetics (zahids), devoted worshippers and those who repented.

6. The individual should have an honest estimation of how he is faring, and he should be aware of his shortcomings and the causes thereof, and how the Satan was able to gain control over him. If the cause of his drifting away was sexual desire, then let him strive to protect himself by getting married, and if he is not able to do that, then let him fast a great deal, for it will be a shield for him, as the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) told us. An-Nawawi said: "What is meant here is that fasting will reduce sexual desire. If the temptation has to do with other desires, or specious arguments, let him hasten to deal with it and counteract it with the opposite." What we have mentioned above are among the means of protection against trials and temptations, as the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) taught us. And Allah knows best.

(They – the believers - say): "Our Lord! Let not our hearts deviate (from the truth) after You have guided us, and grant us mercy from You. Truly, You are the Bestower." (Qur'an 3:8)

[1] Sheikh Abdullah Ghunaiman is a Professor in the Department of Higher Studies in the Islamic University of Madina, Saudi Arabia. He is the one who abridged this book.

[2] Rafidah, (Arabic: "Rejecters"), broadly means Shia who reject the caliphate of Muhammad's successors (Abubakar, Umar and Uthman). The term Rfidah cannot be applied to the all Shia sects but only to the extremists among them who believe in the divine right of Ali to succeed the Prophet (s.a.w) and who condemn Abubakar, Umar and Uthman as unlawful rulers of the Muslim community. The Rafidah were also considered by some to be one of three main groups that compose the Shia Imamiyyah, the other two being the Ghulat (extremists) and the Jarudiyyah (or Hauthis among the Zaydiyah). Rafidah generally reject all the Prophets companions (r.a) except four or five and ascribe them to unbelief. ET

[3] Batinites or Batiniyyah refers to groups that distinguish between an outer, exoteric (zahir) and an inner, esoteric (batin) meaning in Islamic scriptures. The term has been used in particular for an allegoristic type of scriptural interpretation developed among some Shia groups, stressing the batin

meaning of texts. It has been retained by all branches of Isma'ilism and its Druze offshoots. The Alawites practice a similar system of interpretation. Sunni writers have subsequently used the term polemically in reference to rejection of the evident meaning of scripture in favor of its baṭīn meaning. (Wikipedia) ET

[4] Jahmiyyah are also known as Jabriyyah (the compulsionists), they believed that man has no freedom of will and that all his actions are subject to compulsion of Allah. Their leaders are Ja'ad bin Diraham and Jahm bin Safwan. These beliefs could also be found in al – Kafi, the Shia book of hadiths. ET

[5] The Qarmatians (Arabic: قرامطة Qarāmita; also transliterated Carmathians, Qarmathians, Karmathians) were a syncretic religious group that combined elements of Zoroastrianism (fire worship) with the Ismaili Shia Islam centered in al-Hasa (Eastern Arabia), where they established a religious utopian republic in 899 CE. They are most famed for their revolt against the Abbasid Caliphate. Mecca was sacked by the sect's leader, Abu Tahir al-Jannabi, outraging the Muslim world, particularly with their theft of the Black Stone and desecration of the Zamzam Well with corpses during the Hajj season of 930 CE (Wikipedia). ET

[6] The Mu'atazilites means those who withdrew or the secessionists. They believed that those who commit grave sins are neither complete unbelievers nor perfect believers, such people are placed midway between unbelief and faith – an intermediate state. They denied divine attributes for to them that entailed plurality of eternals. They state that it is compulsory upon Allah to reward the good and punish the evil. They say Allah's Will has nothing to do with men's acts and they believe that the Qur'an is created while Allah said in the Qur'an that it is His speech. Their leader was Wasil bin 'Ata. Most of the Shia Imamiyyah scholars are Mu'atazilites and all the above creeds could be found in their books of hadiths such as al – Kafi and Bihar al – Anwar. ET

[7] The people of Al-Qadariyyah deny the existence of fate and contend that Allah The Almighty does not have knowledge of occurrences beforehand. Their belief indicates that He is not aware of things until after they come to pass and this is a clear negation of His prior Knowledge. It is an unmistakable aberration, disbelief in Allah The Almighty and denial of indisputably established religious facts (www.islmweb.net). ET

[8] These are the anthropomorphist (anthropomorphism): believe that Allah has body like that of human body or the ascription of a human attribute or behavior to Allah. Ahlus Sunnah are against this creed for Allah the Most High said, **'There is nothing like unto Him, and He is the All-Hearer, the All-Seer,'**

[Shuraa 42:11] and upon this verse, upon [the meaning contained in] its beginning and end, we declare Him, the Most High, to be totally and utterly free of any likeness to His creation and do not ascribe the qualities of the creation to Him, whilst affirming [His] Attributes as befits His Majesty and Exaltedness. ET

[9] The Shi movement called the Isma'iliyah, with a number of widely differing sub-sects... Following the death in 765 CE of the sixth Shia Imam, Ja'afar al-Sadiq, some of his followers insisted that his son Isma'II, whom they claimed Ja'afar had named his successor but who had already died, was nevertheless the seventh imam. Hence, Isma'ilis are often known as "Seveners." Central to Isma'ili doctrine from the beginning has been the distinction between exoteric aspects of religion, which are said to change from prophet to prophet, and esoteric aspects that remain constant behind transient symbols (www.islamicus.org). ET

[10] Nusayriyyah (they are also called Alawite) is an extreme Shi'ite group named after its purported founder, Abu Shu'ayb Muhammad ibn Nusayr (d.868). Nusayri doctrine is a mixture of Islamic, Gnostic and Christian beliefs. The Nusayris possess three distinctive doctrines which have led them to be treated as heretics by Sunni Muslims. The belief in incarnation. The Nusayris believe that Ali is God in the flesh. Ali created Muhammad from his spirit, and Muhammad created Salman, an early Shi'ite saint. These three form a Trinity in which Ali is described as the 'meaning', Muhammad is the 'name' and Salman is the 'door'. The rejection of the Qur'an and all forms of prayer associated with the Sunni tradition. All Islamic teaching can be interpreted spiritually and therefore does not have to be taken literally. Nusayris believe in reincarnation. Contrary to Islamic belief, the Nusayris claim that women do not have souls and, therefore, there is no need to explain the secrets of Nusayri doctrine to women (www.philtar.ac.uk/encyclopedia). ET

[11] He is the Judge Imaduddeen Abul Hasan Abdul-Jabbar bin Ahmad al-Hamdani, he is a the Mu'atazilite scholar of his time and his book Thathbitul Dalailul Nubuwwah is one of the best books on this issue. You can find this narration in volume 2, on page 549. AB

[12] This hadith is recorded by Ibn Majah in his Sunan on the authority of Jabir. It is a hadith which has been credited back to the Prophet (s.a.w), but it is weak hadith. AB

[13] His name is Abu Hafsah Umar bin Ahmad bin Uthman al-Bagdadi, he died in the year 385AH (refer to the book; Tazkiratul Huffaz, vol. 3, pg. 183). AB

[14] They claimed that all fishes love Ali (r.a) except those types. See also the Segment on Kufan flood for details. Refer to King James version of the Bible,

Leviticus, 11:6-8 (concerning eating Rabbit or hare) and Leviticus, 11:9-12 (concerning eating scaleless fishes). See also Deuteronomy 14:16. ET

[15] Some of the Shia narrations that commanded not only taking away people's wealth but their lives are: 1. And it is narrated in al Illal from saheeh (chain of narration) from Dawood b. Farqad who said: I said to abi Abdullah (as): "What do you say about killing the nasib (those who are not Shia Rafidah)?" Imam (as) said: "The blood is halal (permissible) but I fear upon you, so if you are able to bring down upon him a wall or drown him in water so that no one witnesses by it upon you then do so." I said: "So what do you consider about his property?" Imam (as) said: "Destroy upon it what you are able to." 2. From them – what the shaikh narrated in (by) the saheeh/authentic (chain of narration) from Hafs b. al Bakhtari from abi Abdullah (as) who said: "Take wealth of the nasib (non Shia) wherever you find it and send to us the khums (fifth portion)." (Hadaïq al Nadhirah). 3. Narrated the shaikh (Shaikh Tusi) in al Tahdheeb in saheeh/authentic (chain of narration) from Hafs b. al Bakhtari from abi Abdullah (as) who said: "Take wealth of the nasib (those who are not Shia) wherever you find it and send to us the khums (fifth portion).", narrated by last sanad (chain of narration) Mu'alla b. Khunais from abi Abdullah (as) similar to it. (al Tahdheeb of Tusi). These are just samples of their narrations on looting people's wealth for it is permissible for them in their creed. ET

[16] According to Shia Rafidah all people are children of whore except them. In their narrations we find: 1. Ali b. Muhammad from Ali b. al Abbas from al Hasan b. Abdur Rahman from Asim b. Hameed from abi Hamza from abi Ja'far (as), (narrator) said: I to him (as): "Indeed some of our companions are slandering and accusing those from their opponents." So [Imam (as)] said: "Best to stop them." Then [Imam (as)] said: "O Abu Hamza, by Allah, indeed the people, all of them, are children of prostitutes except our Shias." Then [Imam (as)] said: "We are owners of the khums and we have made it haram (illegal) on all the people except our Shias" (al-Kafi, vol. 8, pg. 285). 2. A Shia scholar Ayatullah Ali Tabatabai stated: "The attribution of Iman (belief) and brotherhood towards the opponents (non-Shia) is completely invalid. There are explicit and concurrent hadiths which invalidate this claim, furthermore there are concurrent hadiths from the Imams (as) mocking and cursing the opponents (non Shia), as well as calling them worse than Jews and Christians, and filthier than dogs. (Riyadul Masail by Ayatullah Ali Tabatabai, Volume 8 page 68). ET

[17] Shia taking the day of Ashura as a day for mourning for the murder of Imam Husain is nothing but a form of igniting hatred and love of vengeance against Ahlus Sunnah because their scholars are telling them that they are the

one who killed him, thus they are not doing so as an expression of love to him or to family of the Prophet (s.a.w). AB

[18] Zandaqah is the description of Zindiq, meaning those who surrendered to Islamic faith but did not accept it wholeheartedly; they despised Islam both as a religion and as a state, but they devised to stay within it in order to plot against it. ET

[19] Muhammad Khodabandeh or Khudabanda, also known as Muhammad Shah or Sultan Muhammad born 1532; died 1595 or 1596), was Shah of Persia from 1578 until his overthrow in 1587 by his son Abbas I. He was the fourth Safavid Shah of Iran and succeeded his brother, Ismail II. Khodabanda was the son of Shah Tahmasp I by a Turcoman mother, Sultanum Begum Mawsillu, and grandson of Ismail I, founder of the Safavid Dynasty. Khuda means slave in the Persian language and Banda means Allah, thus the name means Abdullah (Wikipedia). ET

[20] The hadith is mentioned in Musnad Ahmad (vol. 2. pg. 171), which have been sorted by Ahmad Shakir. AB

Scholars of hadiths and its sciences have dismissed the narrations which pertain to the abdal. For instance, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah in al-Manar al-Munif p. 136 stated, “And from that, all the narrations on the abdal, aqtab...are unauthentic [batil] from Allah’s Messenger (s.a.w).”

Ibn al-Qayyim continues, “And the nearest of what is in them is, ‘do not revile the people of the Levant, as from amongst them are “replacements,” whenever one passes away Allah replaces his position with another man,’ Imam Ahmad related it; it is not authentic as [the isnad is] unconnected.”

In his Mawdu’at vol. 3, pg. 152, Ibn al-Jawzi also related some of the narrations mentioning the abdal and stated, “There is not in these narrations anything authentic.”

Ibn taimiyyah was asked concerning the Abdal and he answered as follows: “As for the names that are in circulation among many of the pious people and common folk, such as the ghawth who is in Makkah, the four awtad, the seven aqtab, the forty abdal and the three hundred nujuba’, these are names that are not found in the Book of Allah, nor are they narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w) via any sound or weak chain of authority, except the word abdal, concerning whom there is a Syrian hadith whose chain of authority is munqati’ (disjoined or cut up); it is narrated from ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib (r.a) and attributed to the Prophet (s.a.w), that he said: “...for among them [the people of Syria] there are abdal; every time one of them dies, Allaah replaces him with another man.” These names are not found in the words of the salaf (predecessors) in the manner mentioned there, nor are they narrated in this

manner and with these meanings from the Shaykhs who are accepted by the ummah in general. They are narrated in this form from some of the middle shaykhs, who mentioned them either quoting from others or without confirming (that they are true). As for the phrase al-Ghawth and al-Ghiyaath, no one deserves this title except Allah, who is the helper of those who seek help (ghiyaath al-mustagheetheen), so it is not permissible for anyone to seek help from anyone else, not from any angel who is close to Him or from any Prophet who was sent. Whoever claims that the people of earth can refer their concerns, such as asking to be spared harm or asking for mercy from the three hundred, and the three hundred refer that to the seventy, and the seventy refer that to the forty, and the forty refer that to the seven, and the seven refer that to the four, and the four refer that to al-ghawth, then he is a liar who has gone astray and is a mushrik (polytheists). And Allah tells us about the polytheists (interpretation of the meaning):

“And when harm touches you upon the sea, those that you call upon vanish from you except Him (Allah Alone)” (17:67). In another verse Allah the Most High said: **“Is not He (better than your gods) Who responds to the distressed one, when he calls on Him” [27:62].** How can the believers refer their concerns via many intermediaries when Allaah says (interpretation of the meaning): **“And when My slaves ask you (O Muhammad) concerning Me, then (answer them), I am indeed near (to them by My Knowledge). I respond to the invocations of the supplicant when he calls on Me (without any mediator or intercessor). So let them obey Me and believe in Me, so that they may be led aright” [2:186].**

All the Muslims know that neither the common folk of the Muslims nor their well known shaykhs conveyed their concerns to Allaah, whether outwardly or inwardly, via these intermediaries. Exalted be Allaah above any resemblance to His creations such as kings, and far above what the wrongdoers say. This is akin to the Rafidi claim that in every age there must be an infallible imam who is the proof of Allah (Hujjat-Allah) against those who are accountable, and that perfect faith cannot be attained otherwise. Rather this sequence and number of intermediaries is in some ways like the Ismaili and Nusayri etc belief in intermediaries (such as al-sabiq, al-tali, al-natiq, al-asas, al-jasad, etc) for which Allaah has not sent down any authority.

With regard to the awtad, some say that So and so is one of the awtad, meaning thereby that by means of him Allaah establishes faith and religious commitment in the hearts of those whom Allaah has guided through him, just as the earth is made firm by its “pegs” (mountains). This meaning applies to every scholar who met this description. Every person by means of whom knowledge and faith became established among the masses is like the awtad and great mountains. Whoever has less knowledge is a lesser in wataad

(knowledge). But that is not limited to four or more or less than that, rather limiting the number to four is akin to the astrologers' idea that the earth should have four awtad.

With regard to the qutub, this is also found in their words: So and so is one of the aqtab, or So and so is a qutub. Everyone who is the focal point of some religious or worldly matter, whether secretly or openly or outward, is the qutub and focal point of that matter. This is not limited to seven or more or less than that. But the one who is praiseworthy in this regard is one who is a focal point for maintaining soundness in religious and worldly matters, not simply maintaining soundness worldly matters. This is the qutub according to them. The same applies to the word badal, which is mentioned by many of them.

With regard to the marfoo' hadith, it is most likely that these are not the words of the Prophet (s.a.w), for faith existed in the Hijaz and Yemen before the conquest of Syria. Syria and Iraq were kafir (unbelievers) lands, then during the caliphate of 'Ali (r.a), it was proven that he said: "A group will split away from the main body of the Muslims and they will be fought by the one of the two groups that is closer to the truth." 'Ali and his companions were closer to the truth than the people of Syria who fought them. It is well known that those of the Sahabah (companions) who were with 'Ali, such as 'Ammar ibn Yasir, Sahl ibn Hunayf and the like, were better than those who were with Mu'awiyah. So how can it be believed that all the abdal, who are the best of creation, were all in Syria? This is definitely false, even though there are well known reports which speak of the virtue of Syria and its people, because everything has its own characteristics and limits. One should only speak on the basis of knowledge and justice.

Those who speak of the badal explain it in several ways, such as saying that they are substitutes for the Prophets, or that every time one of them dies, Allah replaces him with another man, or that they change their bad attitudes, deeds and beliefs into good ones. None of these characteristics can be limited to four people or more or less than that, or to the people of one region of the earth. End quote from Majmoo' Fataawa Ibn Taymiyah (11/433-444).

It is mentioned in the words of some of the salaf and some of the later scholars: So and so is one of the abdaal. For example, in al-Tarikh al-Kabir by al-Bukhari (7/127), in the biography of Farwah ibn Mujaalid, it says: They did not doubt that he was one of the abdal. End quote. As narrated by al-Daraqutni in al-'Ilal (6/29), Imam Ahmad said: If anyone in Iraq was one of the abdal, it was Abu Ishaq Ibrahim ibn Hani'. End quote.

But they did not mean thereby what the Sufis mean in their innovated batini terminology, rather they meant it in the linguistic sense. Whoever among the scholars is spoken of in such terms is one of the heirs of the Prophets by virtue

of the shar'i (Islamic) knowledge that he has, and it is as if he is their substitute in conveying the message of the Revelation and teaching it to the people.

Ibn Taymiyah (may Allah have mercy on him) said in Majmoo' al-Fatawa (4/97): "As for the scholars, they used to say that they were the abdāl, because they were the substitutes of the Prophets, and they took their place in a real sense. They were not people who had no knowledge or who were unknown. Each of them took the place of the Prophets in the field in which he excelled, whether knowledge or worship. They said that they were the group that would continue to prevail until the Hour begins, because they are following guidance and the true religion with which Allah sent His Messengers, the religion which Allah promised would prevail over all other religions, and sufficient is Allah as a witness. End quote. Culled from: <https://islamqa.info/en/83038> ET

[21] Khidr was described in the Qur'an as a slave of Allah thus: "Then they found one of Our slaves, unto whom We had bestowed mercy from Us, and whom We had taught knowledge from Us" (18:65). And Elias was described in the Qur'an as sent Prophet thus: "And verily, Ilyas (Elias) was one of the Messengers. When he said to his people: "Will you not fear Allah? (37:123). And therefore are all human beings, not supernatural and not eternal. Allah said to His Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w): "And We granted not to any human being immortality before you (O Muhammad), then if you die, would they live forever?" (21:34). Therefore definitely those people are dead for that is the Sunnah (tradition and way of doing things) of Allah in His creation and He didn't tell us that there is any exception to that tradition. ET

Here I see the need to add more explanations on Awtad, Qutb, Abdal and Wali etc.: Firstly: The verses of the Qur'an that speaks about the wali (close friend) of Allah explains that he is the pious believer who fears Allah, who loves Allah and supports His Religion, and seeks to please Him, who adheres to the limits He has set and supports His law and His religion. He is one of the slaves of Allaah, and is not beyond His control and authority, rather he does not even have the power to benefit or harm himself, and he does not know what Allah has decreed for him. This is the wali of Allah according to Ahlul Sunnah.

The way in which a person may attain the status of being a wali is to perform obligatory duties, then start to perform nawafil (supererogatory) acts of worship until Allaah loves him, then when He loves him, he will be a true wali of His. In the saheeh hadeeth it says:

"When Allaah loves a person, He calls Angel Gabriel (a.s) and says: 'I love So and so, so love him.' So Gabriel loves him, then he calls out to

the people of heaven, 'Allah loves So and so, so love him.' So the people of heaven love him and he finds acceptance on earth" (Muslim).

Secondly: With regard to the definition of the wali among the Sufis, it has another, innovated meaning that is different from that understood by Ahl al-Sunnah. Among them the wali of Allah is one who has been chosen by Allah, even if he does not have the characteristics of righteousness and piety that qualify him to be loved by Allah. The status of wali, in their view, is a kind of divine gift that is given for no reason and with no wisdom. Hence they believe that some wrongdoers, evildoers, insane and immoral people etc are awliya' simply because they perform extraordinary feats, such as hitting their bodies with knives, playing with snakes and fire, and so on. They even include among their awliya' people who drink alcohol and commit zina (illegal sexual intercourse), and they say: The true wali can never be affected by sin.

And they do not stop there in their definition of a wali; rather they say that the wali controls the universe; he says to a thing "Be!" and it is. In their view, every wali has been appointed by Allaah to control some aspect of creation. Four awliya' are holding the earth by its four corners, and they are called al-awtad (lit. tent pegs). Seven other awliya' each control one of the seven continents of the world, and they are called al-abdal (because when one of them dies, another takes his place – badalahu). There are a number of awliya' in each region: thirty or forty in Egypt, and a similar number in Syria and Iraq, each of whom is appointed in charge of something. Above all of them is one wali who is called the al-qutb al-akbar (lit. great pole or axis) or al-ghawth (source of help), and he is the one who is running the affairs of the entire realm. Thus, they believe in an unseen realm which controls the affairs of mankind like a political state. This state is led by the qutb or ghawth, followed by two Imams or ministers, then the four awtad, then the seven abdal.

This is the concept of awliya' according to the Sufis, and it has nothing to do with the Islamic concept of awliya' that is mentioned in the Qur'an. The wali in Islam is a person whom Allah has guided and helped, and he has earned his Lord's pleasure by following the rules of His sharee'ah; he fears that he may fall into hypocrisy and meet a bad end, and he does not know whether Allah will accept his deeds or not. Whereas they have given the Sufi wali divine characteristics by means of which he controls some aspect of the universe, and he ignores whatever he wants of the laws of Allaah, and the angels are subject to his will.

The basic principles of Sufi concept of awliya' are taken from ancient Greek philosophy which is based on the idea of polytheism. The first one to propose the idea of the Sufi concept of awliya' at the end of the third century AH was Muhammad ibn 'Ali ibn al-Hasan al-Tirmidhi, whom they call al-Hakeem (the

wise). He is not the same as the imam who wrote the well known collection of hadeeth which is called Sunan al-Tirmidhi. Then after that their views became well known and the books of their leaders are filled with these ideas. If we start reporting all that they have said about this issue and all their false notions, it would take too long. But so that no one will think that we are attributing to them things that are not true, there follow the names of some of their sources, and you will find that what we have mentioned is the least abhorrent of their ideas. See: al-Futoohaat al-Makkiyyah by Ibn 'Arabi (2/455, 537); al-Yawaaqeet wa'l-Jawaahir by 'Abd al-Wahhaab al-Sha'raani (2/79); al-Mu'jam al-Sufi by Su'aad al-Hakeem (189-191, 909-913). For references of Ahl al-Sunnah see: al-Fikr al-Sufi by Shaykh 'Abd al-Rahmaan 'Abd al-Khaaliq (343-383). <https://islamqa.info/en/83038>. ET

[22] Shia in the past and the present believe that if the Qur'an and the Sunnah clash with what they have deduced by their intellects, then the intellect is given precedence and the texts are to be given convenient interpretations and if no such interpretation is discernable, then the texts shall be rejected and cast-off. For instance al-Tusi stated in his book ar-Risail al-Ashar (pg, 235) while commenting on some narrations which stated that all a persons good acts can be lost in the Hereafter if the person cheat other people and backbite them by taking his good deeds and paying those he has cheated, he stated the following those hadiths: "Those reports come to us through single narrators and thus they cannot make us discard the intellectual deduction that says people deeds cannot be lost that way. Even if those hadiths are authentic they must be given suitable interpretations in like manner that we gave some apparent verses of the Qur'an interpretations that suite our intellects."

Another Shia scholar al-Miqdad al-Siyuri stated in his book "al-Anwar al-Jalaliyyah" (pg.155): "... We say: If the intellect and the text contradicts each other, then it is not allowed to accept them since that will mean joining two contraries, nor is it allowed to accept the text and discard the intellect because it would mean that you also have to discard the text because the intellect is the origin of the text, as the intellect is what originally leads to the necessity of the Messenger and the intellect affirms his truthfulness. What remains are the opposite, to work according to the intellect, as for the texts, they may not be completely cast-off because scholars have given two options with regard to this issue. Firstly, we ignore the text until its meaning becomes apparent to us. Secondly, we can give the text a suitable interpretation that is not rejected by the intellect."

Sheikh Lutf-Allah al-Safi stated in his book "Majmu'at al-Rasa'il" (vol.1 pg.47): The source of the belief in the infallibility of the prophet or the Imam, and the necessity for the leader to be infallible is the verdict of the intellect, and the

Islamic law agrees with that ruling ... On the issue of infallibility of prophets, the intellect is the primary reference, it rules that the prophet must be infallible for several reasons."

Summarily Shia scholars in accordance to the above quoted samples of their opinions will reject the apparent clear meaning of any sound hadith or any Qur'anic verse if it contradicts what they agreed upon among themselves as being "intellectual proofs". In other words, whenever a text says something that they do not agree with, they will discard it or try to alter the meaning of the text to suite their desires, this is what they referred to as "suitable interpretation matching the intellect." ET

[23] The above Shia hadith could be found in Bihar al-Anwar, vol. 93, pg. 248 and it is similar to Christians belief that Jesus (a.s) has died for their sins. It is also recorded in Shia books of hadith that: **"Allah Almighty assigned Ali (as) as a banner between Him and His creations. Hence whoever knows him is a believer; whoever denies him is a disbeliever; whoever does not know him is lost; whoever believes in another matter along with him (as) is a polytheist and whoever believes in his Wilayah (Divine Guardianship) shall enter Heaven"** (Ref: Al Kafi vol 1 P. 437, Al Bihar vol 32 P 364, Amali Al Tousi P 487, Hilat Al Abrar vol 2 P 422, Al Hada'iq Al Nadira vol 18 P. 148, Kamal Al Deen P 412). ET

[24] The incidence of Harra was a battle fought at al-Harrah on 26 Dhu al-Hijjah 63 H (26 August 683) then lying to the northeast of Medina. The battle was fought against the armies of Yazid bin Mu'awiyah by the people of Medina. ET

[25] Today he is absent for over one thousand and two hundred years. ET

[26] Ash'ariyyah theology represents a reaction against the extreme rationalism of the Mu'tazilah. It holds that human reason should fall under the authority of divine revelation. Human reason is incapable of discerning good and evil; the goodness or evil of a particular action depends upon God's declaring it to be so. Humanity can only acquire religious truths through revelation. A second aspect of Ash'ariyyah theology concerned the nature of the divine attributes. Contrary to the Mu'tazilites, who understood Qur'anic references to God's physical attributes metaphorically, Ash'ari theology argued for the veracity of these attributes while rejecting all crudely anthropomorphic conceptions of God. Thirdly, contrary to Mu'tazilah theology, Ash'ariyyah taught that the Qur'an was eternal and, therefore, uncreated. (phitar.ac.uk/islam/sunni/ash.html). The school was founded by Imam Abu al-Hasan al-Ash'ari (d. AD 936 / AH 324). The disciples of the school are known as Ash'arites. ET

[27] Khawarij first appeared in the caliphate of Ali (R.A) after the conclusion of Battle of Siffeen. The Khawarij misunderstood some of the decisions and interpretations made by Ali (R.A) as a caliph and as a result they decided to revolt against the head of Islamic state (they have been part of his army). Some of their beliefs are: They regard anyone who commits a major sin (such as adultery or drinking alcohol) as a disbeliever who will remain in Hell forever. This is obvious misguidance [on their part]. The reality is that a Muslim who commits these major sins does not become a disbeliever, but becomes a disobedient evildoer who has to repent and abandon his sin. 2. They regard 'Ali, Mu'aawiyah (may Allah be pleased with them both), and many of the Companions who approved of the arbitration as disbelievers. 3. Rebelling against unjust rulers concerning whom there is no proof that they have fallen into disbelief. (darussalamblog.com). ET

[28] A former Shia scholar Ayatullah Borqei cited some evidences on the successorship of Abubakar and Umar from Shia books and commented upon it thus: "In the exegeses of the Qur'an, chapter 66, verse 3, we read in Tafsir as – Safi, and Tafsir al – Qummi, and on the authority of Zajjaj and Ayyashi that the Messenger of Allah informed his wife that Abubakar and Umar will be successors and leaders after him. According to the hadith, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) told his wife Hafsa (a secret) that: "Surely, Abubakar will be the commander of the faithful after me followed by your father." She asked him: "who informed you of this?" He replied: "I was informed by the All – Knower, the All – Informed." Hafsa informed Aisha the news on that day. It shall be noted that the Messenger of Allah gave his wife this information in order to gladdened her heart and to make her happy; he didn't inform her this as a bad, distressing and painful news because he didn't tell her that your father is going to betray Allah's command and that of His Messenger (s.a.w), and that he going to commit injustice by usurping power and with such action he is going to be a source of misguidance. If it is assumed that this is what will happen, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) would have as a call to duty, stood up, forbid that and warn people clearly against such tendency, and command them not to accept the leadership of anybody other than those appointed by Allah to lead the Muslim community and he would have sent emissaries and messengers to all parts of the Muslim community warning them against accepting unlawful authority, informing them that Ali is the one appointed by Allah and he would have invited Abubakar and Umar in the mosque and took their vows and allegiance before all the people that they shall never attempt to take over authority from Imam Ali (a.s); in fact this undertaking would have been carried out with all seriousness that it deserved during what remains of the Prophet's life span. So, think over it.

With regard to the reason why the Messenger of Allah doesn't want that message to spread (that Abubakar and Umar will become leaders after him)s; it shall be known that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) want the principle of consultation to be applied by the Muslims when choosing their leaders as Allah has described believers thus: "...And who conduct their affairs by mutual consultation..." (42:38). If the message spread this principle will be jeopardized, because people will settle for the idea that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has already appointed a successor (and thereafter throughout history some people will be claiming Divine right to rule). Through consultation all Muslims and those who have influence and power will consult, discuss and contact each other in order for the Islamic state to choose the best leader. Therefore strengthening the principles of consultation is more important to the Messenger of Allah than strengthening the principle of Divine appointment, because the former principle is divinely ordained, while the latter principle has no basis in Islamic law. ET

[29] They are a Shia sect who supports the Abbasids claims to Caliphate and the sole right to succeed the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). Their arguments for deserving the Caliphate are: Abbas bin Abdulmutallab was his uncle, his heir and the closest person to him. Since there is no Imamah among women, Fatima (the daughter of the Messenger of Allah) has no inheritance with regard to Imamah and according to Islamic law cousins and grand children will not inherit anything with the existence of the uncle. Therefore Ali and the children of Fatima cannot inherit Imamah with the presence of Abbas. Due to these Abbas and his children deserved the Imamah over all people. with the above argument the Rawandites discarded the concept of Shura (consultation) in choosing a leader and said that it is invalid and by so doing confirming the right of inheritance through blood relationship, thus developing another theory of Imamah (in fact all Shia sects claims to Imamah are base on inheritance and the right to inherit the Prophet – by this the argument of Rawundiyyah is stronger than that of Rafidah). Their line of Imams goes as follows: The Prophet and after him Abbas (his uncle), then Abdullah bin Abbas, then Ali bin Abdullah bin Abbas, then Muhammad bin Ali, then Ibrahim bin Ali, then Abdullah bin Muhammad, then Abdullah bin Mansur as-Saffah, then Muhammad bin Abi Ja'afar etc. and onward to the Last Day. ET

[30] From Shia books Ali bin Abi Talib was quoted to have said: "...And so far as consultation (to select a leader) is concerned, it was limited to the Muhajirin and Ansar and whomever they selected become the leader as per the approval and pleasure of Allah..." (Nahjul Balagah). Here are other opinions of Imam Ali from Shia books: In a narration of the Imams; On the authority of Imam Rida, from his father Imam Kazim, from his father Imam Sadiq, who

heard from his father Imam Baqir, who said his grandfather, the Prophet (s.a.w) said: "Whoever comes to you with the intension of dividing the community, and snatching from the Muslims their right by trying to become leader without consultation; kill him the All – Mighty, Allah has permitted that" (Uyun Akhbar al – Rid by Saduq, Muruj adh – Dhahab, vol.2 pg.62). Imam Ali's belief in the doctrine of consultation was unshakable for after being give a deadly blow, before he died, people come to him asking him to appoint a leader for them but he refused. Then they said to him: "If we lost you, we will give our oath of allegiance to Hasan (a.s). He replied; I do not command you (to do that), nor prevent you, you better knows your affair" (Tahdhib al – Dala'ilun Nubuwwah, vol.1, pg.212). In his will to his children before he died he enjoin them among other things: "...Enjoin the doing of good and forbid the doing of evil, otherwise the worst of you will be made rulers over you, and the best of you will pray, and their prayers will not be accepted" (Maqtal Amirul Mumineen, pgs.41-42). ET

[31] It came in the book, Nahjul balagah (a Shia book): "Verily, those who made the oath of allegiance to Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (R.A) have sworn allegiance to me. Now (those) who were present at the election have no right to go back against their oath of allegiance and those who were absent on the occasion have no right to oppose it. And so far as consultation is concerned (to select a leader) it was limited to the Muhajirin and Ansar and whomsoever they selected become the leader (Imam) as per approval and pleasure of Allah. If somebody goes against such decision with criticism or innovation (Bid'at), then he should be persuaded to adopt the course followed by others, and if he refuses to fall in line with others, then war is the only course left open to adopt against him because he has refused to follow the course followed by the believers...." ET

[32] Some virtues of Abubakar are: "Abdullah bin Mas'ud reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: If I were to choose a bosom friend I would have definitely chosen Abubakar as my bosom friend, but he is my brother and my companion and Allah, the Exalted and Glorious has taken your brother and companion (meaning Prophet himself) as a friend" (Muslim). When the Prophet was alive he made Abubakar leader of pilgrimage of the year he didn't went for it and when he was sick he made him lead Muslims in prayer.

[33] Mursal hadith is a hadith in which the name of the companion reporting directly from the Prophet is omitted. ET

[34] The two Islamic ceremonies that of ending the fast of Ramadan and that of sacrifice on the tenth day of the twelfth month of the Islamic calendar. ET

[35] A similar narration come in the Shia book Nahjul Balagh (Sermon number 40) in what seem a reply to Khawarij thus: "When Imam Ali heard Kharijites saying: 'verdict is only that of Allah,' he replied them saying: 'The sentence is right but what (they think) it means, is wrong. It is true that verdict lies but with Allah, but these people say that (the function of) governance is only for Allah. The fact is that there is no escape for men from ruler good or bad. The faithful persons perform (good) acts in his rule while the unfaithful enjoys (worldly) benefits in it. During the rule (whether that of the good or the bad), Allah would carry everything to end. Through the ruler tax is collected, enemy is fought, roadways are protected and the right of the weak is taken from the strong till the virtuous enjoys peace and allowed protection from (the oppression of) the wicked. ET

[36] Shia Rafidah argument for necessity of a leader is that the existence of an infallible Imam in every age is necessary and that it is not permitted that the world will be devoid of an Imam for the guidance of mankind, the administration of society and the implementation of Shari'ah injunctions. Now the question is what of the above mentioned benefit has the Shia got from the awaited Imam or any of the Imams with the exception of Ali? ET

[37] In the Shia book of hadith Fur'u al-Kafi vol. 5, pg. 529 (In the book of Marriage) it was reported that the Prophet went to Fatimah and met color of her face turned yellow and when he asked her why she replied it is due to hunger out of want and destitution. In Bihar al-Anwar (vol. 43, pg. 350) it is recorded that Imam Ali went to the market trying to sell his sword for he has no money. ET

[38] In Shia Hadith books it is recorded: "Taqqiyah is from my religion and that of my fathers and there is no belief -in another version no religion- for him who has no taqqiyah" (Al-Kafi, 2/219,224 (authenticated by Majlisi and Bahnude); Ayashi "Tafsir" 1/166). They attributed these lies to the Prophet (s.a.w): "He who leaves taqqiyah is like he who leaves Prayer" (Al Hidayah, by Saduq p51, Man La Yahduruhu al faqih, 2/127, Wasael al Shia, 7/94-11/466, Bihar al Anwar, 50/181-64/103-72/412, Kashf al ghummah, by Arbeeli 3/182"). A Shia Rafidah scholar: Shaykh Saduq, ibn Babaveyh al-Qummi in his book "al-Itiqadat" (p 114) said: "Our belief regarding taqqiyah is that it is obligatory. He who leaves it is like he who leaves praying, and it's impermissible to dismiss it until the Mahdi rises, he who leaves it before al Mahdi rises has left the religion of Allah and the religion of Shia Imamiyyah and has disobeyed Allah, the Prophet and the Imams."

With Ahlus Sunnah Taqiyyah explained by scholars thus: Imam Qurtubi in Jami'ul Ahkam wrote: "And it was said that if believer resides between disbelievers, if he has a fear about his life, he can manage them by his tongue, while his soul would be full with belief. AND TAQIYA ISN'T PERMITTED EXCEPT IF THERE IS A FEAR OF BEING KILLED, OR FEAR THAT LIMB COULD BE CUTTED, OR (ANY OTHER) GREAT PUNISHMENT. And if someone is forced to make kufr, authentic view that he can persist and refuse to say kalimatul-kufr".

Hafidh ibn Kathir in his commentary on 106 verse of surah an-Nahl, said: "Except one who was forced while his heart is at peace with the faith." This is an exception in the case of one who utters statements of disbelief and verbally agrees with the Mushrikin because he is forced to do so by the beatings and abuse to which he is subjected, but his heart refuses to accept what he is saying, and he is, in reality, at peace with his faith in Allah and His Messenger . The scholars agreed that if a person is forced into disbelief, it is permissible for him to either go along with them in the interests of self-preservation, or to refuse, as Bilal did when they were inflicting all sorts of torture on him, even placing a huge rock on his chest in the intense heat and telling him to admit others as partners with Allah. He refused, saying, "Alone, Alone." And he said, "By Allah, if I knew any word more annoying to you than this, I would say it." May Allah be pleased with him. Similarly, when the Liar Musaylimah asked Habib bin Zayd Al-Ansari, "Do you bear witness that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah" He said, "Yes." Then Musaylimah asked, "Do you bear witness that I am the messenger of Allah" Habib said, "I do not hear you." Musaylimah kept cutting him, piece by piece, but he remained steadfast insisting on his words. It is better and preferable for the Muslim to remain steadfast in his religion, even if that leads to him being killed, as was mentioned by Al-Hafiz Ibn `Asakir in his biography of `Abdullah bin Hudhafah Al-Sahmi, one of the Companions. He said that he was taken prisoner by the Romans, who brought him to their king. The king said, "Become a Christian, and I will give you a share of my kingdom and my daughter in marriage." `Abdullah said: "If you were to give me all that you possess and all that Arabs possess to make me give up the religion of Muhammad even for an instant, I would not do it." The king said, "Then I will kill you." `Abdullah said, "It is up to you." The king gave orders that he should be crucified, and commanded his archers to shoot near his hands and feet while ordering him to become a Christian, but he still refused. Then the king gave orders that he should be brought down, and that a big vessel made of copper be brought and heated up. Then, while `Abdullah was watching, one of the Muslim prisoners was brought out and thrown into it, until all that was left of him was scorched

bones. The king ordered him to become a Christian, but he still refused. Then he ordered that `Abdullah be thrown into the vessel, and he was brought back to the pulley to be thrown in. `Abdullah wept, and the king hoped that he would respond to him, so he called him, but `Abdullah said, "I only weep because I have only one soul with which to be thrown into this vessel at this moment for the sake of Allah; I wish that I had as many souls as there are hairs on my body with which I could undergo this torture for the sake of Allah." According to some reports, the king imprisoned him and deprived him of food and drink for several days, then he sent him wine and pork, and he did not come near them. Then the king called him and asked him, "What stopped you from eating" `Abdullah said, "It is permissible for me } under these circumstances { , but I did not want to give you the opportunity to gloat." The king said to him, "Kiss my head and I will let you go." `Abdullah said, "And will you release all the Muslim prisoners with me" The king said, "Yes." So `Abdullah kissed his head and he released him and all the other Muslim prisoners he was holding. When he came back, `Umar bin Al-Khattab said, "Every Muslim should kiss the head of `Abdullah bin Hudhafah, and I will be the first to do so." And he stood up and kissed his head. May Allah be pleased with them both." So obviously we are permitted to do taqqiyah when we faced with real danger, and even in that cases we can refuse it, and die for our beliefs. [www.islamqa](http://www.islamqa.com) ET

[39] He means that the Jews are accusing Mary of profligacy and if the Christian is denying what has been revealed to Muhammad (s.a.w) he will never be able to answer that ambiguity about the affairs of Jesus. This is because Jesus has commanded his followers to believe in Muhammad (s.a.w) but if the Christian refused to believe in him then he is disbelieving in Jesus.
AB

[40] Nawasib is the plural of Nasibi. In Ahlus Sunnah usage a Nasibi is the one who abuses Imam Ali and hates him. Ahlus Sunnah do not accept hadiths reported by a Nasibi so also that of Shia Rafidah. Shia Rafidah today considered all Muslims other than their followers as Nawasib. A Shia scholar Muhammad al-Hasan al-Najafi al-Jauhari in his book "Jawahar al-Kalam" (vol.6, pg.66) stated: "The Nasibi title is designated (for a person) over five reasons: For a Khariji who criticizes Ali (as); Secondly for he who attributes something that invalidates uprightness (adala) to any of the Imams, Thirdly, for he who denies a virtue of theirs when he heard it; Fourthly, for one who believes in the superiority of someone other than Ali (over him); Fifthly, he who

denied the report of explicit election of Ali after hearing it or its reaching to him in a manner that allows him to confirm itll.” Thus it can be deduced from the fourth reason given by Shia scholar, complete Ahlus Sunnah become Nasibi, since Ahlus-Sunnah believes in superiority of Abubakar (r.a) over Ali (r.a), as this was the view of Ali(r.a) himself, which was authentically reported in Mutawatir (concurrent or successive) reports present in book of Sunnah. ET

[41] Batinites are members of the Batiniyyah sect who believe that the Devine texts have hidden meanings. They interpret religious texts on the basis of hidden rather than literal meanings. They claimed that the Qur’an has an outer, exoteric (Zahir) meaning and an inner esoteric meaning (Batin). These types of interpretations are developed by Shia groups such as the Ismailites, the Alawites, the Rafdidah and the Druze. ET

[42] Allah said: “And who does more wrong than he who invents a lie against Allah or rejects His Ayat (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, revelations, etc.)? Verily, the Zalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers, etc.) shall never be successful.” (6:21). And: “And who can be more unjust than he who invents a lie against Allah, or says: "I have received inspiration," whereas he is not inspired in anything; and who says, "I will reveal the like of what Allah has revealed." (6:93). ET

[43] Allah said: “They ask you concerning fighting in the Sacred Months (i.e. 1st, 7th, 11th and 12th months of the Islamic calendar). Say, "Fighting therein is a great (transgression) but a greater (transgression) with Allah is to prevent mankind from following the Way of Allah, to disbelieve in Him, to prevent access to Al-Masjid-al-Haram (at Makkah), and to drive out its inhabitants, and Al-Fitnah is worse than killing..." (2:217). ET

[44] The words: Shia, Tashayyu‘ and Mushaya‘ah, as far as the literal meaning is concerned, centered around meanings such as following, helping, agreeing with, uniting upon a matter or gathering upon it. During the first era of Islam (during the time of Ali), the title Shia meant nothing else but support and help. It was not related in any way to the present-day beliefs of the Shia. Further, this word or title was not confined to the supporters of ‘Alī (r.a). Ayatullah Borqei stated that: —Imam Ali (r.a) and the rest of the members of the Prophet’s household (family and progeny) didn’t innovate a sect and they never said that they belong to Shia Imamiyyah, or Ismailiyyah, or Zaidiyyah, or Sufiyyah, or Ja‘afariyyah, or Batiniyyah, or Sheikhiyyah or any other sect from among the Shia sects. The children (and grand children) of the Prophet’s (s.a.w) family are also good people and they never affiliate themselves to any sect, far from that they have been following the Book (Qur’an) and the Sunnah. They never claimed the existence of any Sunnah other than the Sunnah of their grandfather. This, in contrast to the Shia Imamiyyah who are saying that

there are twelve Sunnahs and each Imam has a Sunnah different from that of the other Imams (Critique of the right path, pgs. 17-18). ETII

[45] They are the people that worshipped the planets and the stars (sun, moon, venus etc.). ET

[46] They consider Fire as the purest and noblest element, and worship it as a fit emblem of Allah. Their location was the Persian and Median uplands and the Mesopotamian valleys, their religion was reformed by Zardusht (date uncertain, about B.C. 600?). Their scripture is the Zend-Avesta, the bible of the Parsis. They were "the Wise men of the East" mentioned in the Gospels. ET

[47] Ayatullah Borqei a former Shia Scholar quoting extensively from the Shia book Nahjul Balagah proved that Imam Ali never sought for the Caliphate or even like it. He stated in his Naqd al-Mura'at: "It is very clear from the words (and actions) of Imam Ali and his knowledgeable children that they do not consider themselves leaders who have been appointed by Allah or that Allah has appointed them as leaders and successors to the Messenger of Allah... If there is any legal text with regard to the leadership and successorship of Ali or any of his children, he would not have shown his hatred (reservations), avoidance, and shunning taking over the responsibility of leadership as we have seen in his sermons: "Leave me alone and seek for someone else...If you leave me then I am the same as you are. It is possible I would listen and obey whomever you make in charge of your affairs. I am better for you as a councilor than as a chief." In another occasion he said: "You advanced towards me shouting; „allegiance," „allegiance," like a She-camel having delivered newly born young. I held back my hand but you pulled it towards you, I draw back my hand but you dragged it..." Imam Ali (a.s) also said: "By Allah I had no liking for the Caliphate, nor any interest in government but yourselves invited me to it and prepared me for it..." Imam Ali also would not have said: "Verily I did not seek for people, but they sought for me and I didn't give them vow of allegiance but they gave me their vows of allegiance..." His hatred for leadership and display of his avoidance of it was so great to the extent of saying: "...This (taking responsibility of leadership) is brackish water and a morsel that chokes the throat of whoever swallows it." It was also narrated in Sharh Nahjul Balagah (commentary to peak of eloquence), by Ibn Abi Hadid that Imam Ali said: "Surely, Allah knows from His Heavens and His Throne that I undoubtedly was hating successorship over the community of Muhammad, until when you have a consensus of opinion over that." Therefore based on this, if Allah has appointed Imam Ali (a.s) to be the leader and the successor of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), he will assuredly not utter the above words or anything similar to them, in the contrast he will have claimed it and state unequivocally that; I and my children are those vested with authority by Allah

(after the Messenger of Allah). Therefore those who made these claims are those who fabricated narrations (hadiths and distorted the meaning of verses of the Qur'an so that it comply with their views); these are the type of people whom the maxim, "they are more than the king himself," suited perfectly." ET

[48] See also sermon no. 25 in Shia book Nahjul Balaghah. ET

[49] Consider this sermon of Imam Ali from Shia book Nahjul Balaghah: "O' people, your bodies are together but your desires are divergent. Your talk softens the hard stones and your action attracts your enemy towards you. You claim in your sittings that you would do this and that, but when fighting approaches, you say (to war), "turn thou away" (i.e. flee away). If one calls you (for help) the call receives no heed. And he who deals hardly with you his heart has no solace. The excuses are amiss like that of a debtor unwilling to pay. The ignoble can not ward off oppression. Right cannot be achieved without effort. **Which is the house besides this one to protect? And with which leader (Imam) would you go for fighting after me? By Allah! Deceived is one whom you have deceived while, by Allah! He who is successful with you receives only useless arrows. You are like broken arrows thrown over the enemy.** By Allah! I am now in the position that I neither confirm your views nor hope for your support, nor challenge the enemy through you. What is the matter with you? What is your ailment? What is your cure? The other party is also men of your shape (but they are so different in character). **Will there be talk without action, carelessness without piety and greed in things not right?"** (Sermon No. 29). ET

[50] Shia Rafidah believed that killing Muslims and taking their properties are an act of worship with which they get nearness to Allah. Here are some of their hadith from their books: "It is narrated in al Illal ash-Shar'i, with sound chain of narration from Dawood b. Farqad who said: I said to abi Abdullah (as): —What do you say about killing the nasib? Imam (as) said: —The blood is halal(permissible) but I fear upon you, so if you are able to bring down upon him a wall or drown him in water so that no one witnesses by it upon you then do so. I said: —So what do you consider about his property? Imam (as) said: —Destroy upon it what you are able to" (Volume 2 Page 601). 2. Narrated the shaikh (Shaikh Tusi) in al Tahdheeb in saheeh/authentic (chain of narration) from Hafs b. al Bakhtari from abi Abdullah (as) who said: —Take wealth of the nasib wherever you find it and send to us the khums (fifth portion). I, narrated by last sanad (chain of narration) Mu'alla b. Khunais from abi Abdullah (as) similar to it.(al Tahdheeb of Tusi). 3. And from Ishaq b. Ammar, who said: Imam al Sadiq (as) said: —The wealth of the nasib, and everything he owns, is halal (permissible) for you except his woman for indeed nikah of people of polytheism is legitimate. And that is that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said:

Do not abuse the people of polytheism because indeed for every nation there is a nikah (marriage), and if I did not fear for you that he murders a man from you with a man from them, while a man from you is better than a thousand men from them, we would have certainly ordered you people to kill them, but that is to the Imam. (Wasail al shia by Shaikh Hurr al Amili, Volume 11, page 60, Hadith no. 2). Above are three sample of their authentic hadith commanding the killing of Muslims, looting their properties and destroying what they cannot be able to take with them. ET

[51] In Islamic jurisprudence, qiyās (Arabic: *قياس*) is the process of deductive analogy in which the teachings of the Hadith are compared and contrasted with those of the Qur'an, in order to apply a known injunction (nass) to a new circumstance and create a new injunction. www.wikipedia ET

[52] Here are Shia Hadiths and their scholars views on Abubakar, Umar , Uthman and the rest of the Prophet's companions: 1. Shia scholar Baqir Majlisi stated regarding Abu Bakr(ra) :

I say: The ahadith evidence upon the kufr of Abubakar and Umar and their chastising, as well as the thawab (reward) for doing la'nah (damnation) upon them and dissociating from them and what is included in their bid'ahs (innovations), most of which has been mentioned in this volume or in other volumes. And what has been stated is sufficient for one to whom Allah wills to guide him to the straight path. (Biharul anwar, vol. 30, pg. 399).

2. Shia scholar Baqir Majlisi stated regarding Umar(ra) :

There is no room for any reasonable person to doubt the Kufr (Apostasy) of Umar, Fa La'nat (then May the curse of) Allah and His Messenger be upon him (i.e. Umar), and upon all those who consider him a Muslim, and upon all those who abstain from cursing him (*Jala Al'Uyoun* p. 45.)

3. Shia scholar Ali bin Hilal al-Karki said regarding Umar(ra) :

Whoever does not find in his heart animosity towards Uthman, and does not deem permissible attacks on his honor, and does not believe that he is a Kaffir, then he is an enemy of Allah and His Messenger, a disbeliever(Kafir) in what Allah revealed. (Nafahaat Al-Lahout; under the biography of Uthman).

4. Shia scholar Baqir Majlisi stated regarding Sahaba those who followed the First three Caliphs:

The praise and virtues of Sahaba, Muhajireen and Ansar mentioned in the verses and ahadith are for those only, who didn't apostate, and didn't became hypocrites, and didn't follow any other caliph than Ali (ra). And those (sahaba) who apostated, and opposed Ali (ra) and befriended his opponents (Abubakar, Umar and Uthman etc.), they are worse than the kuffar. (Hayat ul Quloob, Vol. 2, pg. 916). ET

[53] Narrated Mu'adh ibn Jabal: Some companions of Mu'adh ibn Jabal said: When the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) intended to send Mu'adh ibn Jabal to the Yemen, he asked: How will you judge when the occasion of deciding a case arises? He replied: I shall judge in accordance with Allah's Book. He asked: (What will you do) if you do not find any guidance in Allah's Book? He replied: (I shall act) in accordance with the Sunnah of the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him). He asked: (What will you do) if you do not find any guidance in the Sunnah of the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) and in Allah's Book? He replied: I shall do my best to form an opinion and I shall spare no effort. The Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) then patted him on the breast and said: Praise be to Allah Who has helped the messenger of the Apostle of Allah to find something which pleases the Apostle of Allah" (Abu Dawud). Thus resorting to juristic reasoning (ijtihad) is allowed in Islam. ET

[54] If occurrences can occur without the action of Allah or his wish, that entailed partnership with Him and this type of belief is an act of polytheism and unbelief (someone or something can do something whether Allah allows it or not) and this why those people are likened to Zoroastrians (Mojoos –fire worshippers – who believe in the god of good and the god of evil each acting independent of the other). ET

[55] Alamut (Persian: **آل‌الموت**, meaning "eagle's nest") was a mountain fortress located in Alamut region in the South Caspian province of Daylam near the Rudbar region in Persia (Iran), approximately 100 km (60 mi) from present-day Tehran. Between 1090 and 1256 AD, under the leadership of Hasan-i Sabbah, Alamut became the site of intense activity for the Shi'a Nizari Ismai'lis, functioning as the headquarters of their state, which consisted of a series of unconnected strategic strongholds scattered throughout Persia and Syria, surrounded by huge swathes of hostile territory (the Seljuq Empire). (Wikipedia) ET

[56] Here are some Shia hadiths that showed that visiting graves is better than pilgrimage to the House of Allah in Makka: 1. Imam Sadiq) narrated to Bashir b. Dahhaan: 'If any of you performs ghusl (ritual bath) in the Euphrates and then goes for visiting of Imam Husain with his recognition then for every time he steps on the earth and for every time he lifts his feet off the earth, he will be rewarded with 100 accepted Hajj and 100 accepted Umra and 100 battles in the company of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.) (source: Kamiluz Ziaraat pg. 185). 2. In another tradition Imam Sadiq reveals that: "If one of our Shias goes for Imam Husain's (a.s.) Ziarat, then he will not return but all his sins will be forgiven. For every step that he or his mount takes, 1,000 virtues are written for him, 1,000 sins are forgiven and his status is elevated by a 1,000 degrees"

(Sources: Behaarul Anwar, vol 101, pg 25, tradition 26; Kamiluz Ziaraat, pg 134).

From the Shia Imamiyyah book titled “Nafasul Mahmoon” by Sheikh Abbas Qummi the following narrations are quoted as cited: “Imam Muhammad al Baqir (a.s.) told Muhammad bin Muslim that, “Direct our Shi’ah to visit the grave of Husain bin Ali (a.s.), for it has been made obligatory by Allah, the Mighty, the Sublime, upon every believer who considers Husain (a.s.) to be his Imam”. Imam Ja’far as Sadiq (a.s.) says that, “Whenever anyone amongst you go for the Hajj and then do not go for the pilgrimage of Imam Husayn (a.s.) has abandoned the right from among the rights of the Prophet of Allah (S). For the right of Husayn (a.s.) is made obligatory upon every Muslim by Allah”. He says that, “The one who dies without going to the head of the grave of Husain (a.s.), while he still considers himself to be our Shi’ah, is in fact not our Shi’ah, and even if he goes to Paradise, he will remain as a guest of the inhabitants of Paradise”.

He (Imam Sadiq) asked Aban bin Taghlib, “O Aban! When did you go for the pilgrimage to the grave of Imam Husain (a.s.)?” Aban replied, “By Allah, O son of the Prophet of Allah! A lengthy time has passed since I did not renew the pledge.” Imam replied, “Glory be to my Lord, the Sublime, and praise to Him! In spite of being a nobleman among the Shi’ah you have abandoned the visitation to the grave of Husain? The one who visits the grave of Imam Husain, Allah writes down good deeds for him at every step, and forgives his sins at each step. Then He forgives all of his past and future sins”. Refer to the Shia website: (www.al-islam.org/nafasul-mahnun). ET

[57] These types of beliefs are called dualism, which is the religious doctrine that the universe contains opposed powers of good and evil, especially seen as balanced equals. ET

[58] Imam Ghazali in his book “The Infamies of Batiniyyah” talked about their methods of misleading Muslim thus: **“There is no hope of opposing them (Muslims) by a fight. The only way to make them forego what they have made up their minds about is by cunning and guile. Were we to address to them a call to our doctrine, they would rage against us and be unable to listen to us. So our way is to take over the creed of a group from their sects [a group] who are the feeblest in minds and the most fatuous (vacantly silly, purposeless, idiotic) in individual reasoning and the most pliable in disposition to accept absurdities and the most compliant in believing embellished lies-and these are the Rafidites.**

We shall strengthen our position by affiliating with them and by tracing our descent to the people of the [Prophet’s] house to avoid their evil [i.e. their being against us], and we shall ingratiate ourselves with them by

that which suits their character, viz. the mention of the great injustice and terrible humiliation effected against their forbears. We shall pretend to weep with them over what befell the family of Muhammad (Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) and thereby we shall succeed in denigrating the leaders of their forbears who are their model and pattern. The result will be that, once we have made the circumstances of their [forbears] repulsive in their eyes, and also what their Law transmits to them by the transmission and report of those [forbears] the door of recourse to the Law will be closed [or hard] for them and it will be easy for us to entice them into being stripped of [forfeiting, losing] religion. If there then remains among them anyone holding fast to the literal meanings of the Qur'an and unimpeachable Traditions, we shall suggest among them that those literal texts contain secrets and inner meanings, and that the mark of the stupid man is being deceived by their literal meanings and the sign of acumen [intelligence] is in believing their inner meanings. Then we shall communicate to them our beliefs, alleging that they are what is meant by the literal meanings of the Qur'an. Then when we have duped these, it will be easy for us to entice the rest of the sects after joining [siding with] these [Rafidites] and pretending that they support us.

Then they said: **Our method will be to choose such a man as will help us in our doctrine. We shall claim that he belongs to the People of the House [Muhammad's family], and that all men must swear allegiance to him and are bound to obey him, for he is the Caliph of the Apostle of Allah and preserved from error and slip by help from Allah Most High. [p. 20]** Moreover we shall not make this propaganda known near to the vicinity of the Caliph (Imam) whom we have characterized with infallibility, because the proximity of his abode might rip apart these veils. But if the distance be remote and far away, then when will the one who responds to the propaganda be able to investigate his condition and to get to know the reality of his real situation? (can you now see why the Imams of the Prophet's family are living in Madina while most of those who are narrating their hadiths are living in Kufa- Iraq?). ***Now their aim in all that was power and domination and making free with the wealth and women of the Muslims, and revenging themselves on them for what they believed about them and for what they had over taken them of pillage and bloodshed and had poured upon them of various kinds of misfortune. This, then, is their ultimate aim and the fundamental principle of their affair.***

[59] Those who accredit such attributes to Allah as usually associated to human beings. Some Shia predecessors believed that Allah has body similar to those of human beings as mentioned in their book of hadith al-Kafi that

Hisham bin Hakam and Hisham Ibn Salim Al-Jawaliqi have such beliefs. Refer to al-Kafi volume one on the Chapter of prohibition on as considering Allah as having body and form. ET

[60] They are those who maintain that even the slightest disobedience to the commandments of religion destroys faith in its entirety and makes man an unbeliever and he will remain in Hell-Fire forever. Those with types of belief are found among the Khawarij and the Mua'tazilites. ET

[61] They opined that faith is no more than the knowledge of Allah. Consequently, as long as a man is faithful he will not be effected by any sin committed by him. ET

[62] Consider this hadith from Shia hadith book al-Kafi (Vol. 1, pg. 219): Abu Abdullah (Ja'afar as-Sadiq) said the following about the words of Allah. "God has the most blessed Names. You should address Him in your worship by these Names . . ." (7:180) The Imam said, "We, I swear by Allah, are the most blessed names of Allah without which Allah does not accept any of the good deeds of His servants until they know us properly." So the Imams of the Prophets household are the Names of Allah. Consider this hadith also, from the book: "Imam abu Ja'afar has said the following: "We (family of Prophet Muhammad) are the *al-Mathani* (one of two) that Allah gave to Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w). We are the *Wajhullah* (face of Allah) that move among you on earth. We are the eyes of Allah in His creatures. We are the hands of Allah that are open with blessings for His servants. Those who wanted to know us have known us. There are people who are ignorant about us they are ignorant of us and of the leadership of the pious people." ET

[63] A Shia hadith has been narrated in the Shia book of hadith Bihar al-Anwar (vol. 8, pg. 401) stated: "Love of Ali bin Abi Talib is a goodness that cannot be harmed by any evil deed." ET

[64] Consider this chain of narrators of Shia hadith from al_Kafi: "A number of our people has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Khalid from his father from one he mentioned from Zayd al-Shahham from abu Ja'far (a.s.) who has said the following: (Refer to al-Kafi **Hadith no. 131, Chapter 16, hadith 8**). From this sample you see the defects of Shia hadiths: 1. A number of our people has narrated. Who are those people? Knowledge cannot be taken from an unknown person except in Shia creed. 2. from his father from one he mentioned. Who is the one his father mentioned? So Shia religion is based on reports of the unknown from unknown by unknown and yet they are saying that their principles of religion are taken from the infallibles. If the Imams are infallibles are the reporters also infallibles? ET

[65] It was narrated (from Shia sources) in some hadith with regard to this issue that Ummu Salma (one of his wives) who reported this hadith was one of those who the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) placed under the garment together with the other four when she said to him; **“Am I not of your family? He replied: “You are one of them.” She said: “Then place me under the garment”** (Bihar Anwar, vol. 35, pg. 145). In another hadith the Messenger of Allah said: **“O Allah! To You myself and members of my household and not to the Hell Fire.” Ummu Salma said: O Messenger of Allah and I am with you? He replied: “And with you”** (Amali by Tusi, pg. 85, Bihar Anwar, vol. 25, pg.37). The above hadiths are from Shia books, but Shia are people given to controversy and contention. ET

[66] Ibn Kathir in his Tafsir of Qur'an said on the verse: (Say: “No reward do I ask of you for this except to be kind to me for my kinship with you.”) It means, ‘say, O Muhammad, to these idolaters among the disbeliever of Quraish: I do not ask you for anything in return for this message and sincere advice which I bring to you. All I ask of you is that you withhold your evil from me and let me convey the Messages of my Lord. If you will not help me, then do not disturb me, for the sake of the ties of kinship that exist between you and I.’ ET

[67] Abu Dawud version of the hadith run as follows: “Narrated Abu Bakrah: The Apostle of Allah (s.a.w) said to al-Hasan ibn Ali. This son of mine is a Sayyid (chief), and I hope Allah may reconcile two parties of my community by means of him. Hammad's version has: And perhaps Allah may reconcile two large parties of Muslims by means of him.” ET

[68] Contrary to Shia believe, Imam Ali (R.A) believed that the only way to chose a person to the leadership of the Muslim Community is through consultation and the power to select a leader belong to the Muhajirin and Ansar. When the commander of the faithful Uthman bin Affan (R.A) was murdered in cold blood the rebels came to Ali (R.A) asking him to take over authority but he refused saying to them: **“This is not of your power, this is for the Muhajirin and Ansar, whoever they chose as a leader will be the leader “(Tabari).** When the Muhajirin and Ansar asked him to be the leader, he replied them saying: **“Leave me alone and look for another person... I would be most obedient and loyal to anyone you chose to conduct your affairs, for me to be your vizier (adviser) is better for you than to be your leader” (Nahjul balagah, Tabari).** It was reported that he offered the leadership to Talha (r.a), then to Zubair (r.a) and both did not accept it. Thereafter he said to the Muhajirin and Ansar; vows will be taken in the Mosque and not in secret. That has been the conduct and behavior of Imam Ali (R.A) throughout his life for before his death people requested him to name

someone as his successor but he refused and when they suggested Hasan (R.A) he replied: **“...I do not command you, nor prevent you, you understand better your affairs”** (al-Shafi, vol. 3, pg. 295 by Murtada – and this is a Shia source). ET

[69] A region in Saudi Arabia bordering on the Red Sea, formerly an independent kingdom: contains the Islamic holy cities of Medina and Makka. ET

[70] The Tabi'un (Arabic: التابعون "followers") are the generation of Muslims who were born after the passing of the Prophet Muhammad but who were contemporaries of the Sahaba (companions). ... The ones who came after the Tabi'un are called Tabi' al-Tabi'in. ET

[71] A former Shia scholar Ustaz Ali Qalamdaran stated: There are no jurisprudential (Fiqh or Hadith) books upon which Shia Imamiyyah can rely on because all their books were written after their Imams have passed away and the compilers of those books gathered therein both sound and fabricated (spurious) hadiths (and they are mostly statement and views of the Imams) in contrast to Shia Zaidiyyah for they possessed a book called Majmu'ul Fiqh or al – Musnad li Imam Zaid, which was written by his student Abu Khalid al – Wasiti according to the dictate of his teacher. This is also true with books of Sunni scholars (for they possess books) such as al – Muwatta, by Imam Malik, al – Umm, by Imam Shafi'i, (al- Fiqh al – Akbar and al – Fiqh al – Absat etc. by Abu Hanifa), and al – Musnad, by Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal. There are jurisprudential (and hadiths) books belonging to Shia Imamiyyah sect, which were written by some people (long after the Imams have passed away) and the narrations in the four Shia books namely: al – Kafi, al – Tahzib, al – Istisbhar, and Man la Yahduruhu Faqih. ET

[72] Ihram in Islam is a sacred state which a Muslim must enter in order to perform the major pilgrimage (Hajj) or the minor pilgrimage (Umrah). ET

[73] The hadith reads: Narrated Ali ibn AbuTalib: Abulshaq told that Ali looked at his son al-Hasan and said: “This son of mine is a sayyid (chief) as named by the Prophet (s.a.w), and from his loins will come forth a man who will be called by the name of your Prophet (s.a.w) and resemble him in conduct but not in appearance. He then mentioned the story about his filling the earth with justice” (Abu Dawud). ET

[74] Example of that are: We read in Tarikh Tibari and Sharh Nahjul balagha (*Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 3, p. 223, *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, by ibn abil hadeed, Vol. 4, p. 228, and in Al bidaya wa al nihaya , Vol. 6, p. 311, and Tarikh ibn Khaldun, , Vol. 2, p. 858): Hence, it is confirmed that Abubakar sent armed groups to

guard the roads of Madina, under the command of Ali ibn Abi Talib , Zubair bin al awwam, Talha bin abdullah , Saad bin Abi Waqas , Abdur Rahman bin Auf and Abdullah ibn Masud, during the war against apostasy (those who refused to pay Zakat and those who declared Prophethood).

Ibn Asakir in his book on history stated: Husain used to go to Mu'awiyah (who was the Caliph) and he fought under his leadership along with Yazid and opened Constantinople. In Tarikh Al-Islam by Al-Dhahabi (104/5), it is stated that Husain fought along with Yazid under the leadership of Amir Al-Mu'mineen Mu'awiyah (Source: Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihaya of Ibn Kathir 8/161). In those reports you will find that Mu'awiyah was not just the Amir Al-Mu'mineen of Husain, but Yazid (who fought along with him) was the leader of the army!!! Husain came to Mu'awiyah (who was the Caliph) and fought under his leadership in the army that was lead by Yazid Ibn Mu'awiyah [Tarikh Dimashq, by Ibn Asakir, vol.11, pg. 111]. ET

[75] On the conditions that the narrators are reliable, trust worthy, truthful and has fulfilled all the conditions laid down by scholars of hadith. ET

[76] It is a sect among the sects of Kharijites. ET

[77] In fact Shia in their hadith have narrated that their adherents shall mix with people deceptively for example they stated that Imam Ja'afar Sadiq said: "Mix with them (i.e. non-Shia) externally, but oppose them internally" (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.116). In another place they stated: Imam Ali bin Musa has said: "The one who is not pious has no religion and the one who does not practice Taqiyyah (dissimulation) has no Iman (deep faith)." So he was asked, "O grandson of the Messenger, until when (is one required to practice Taqiyyah)?" He replied, "Until a certain day (i.e. the day Imam Mahdi appears). Whoever does not practice Taqiyyah before the appearance of Imam Mahdi, is not one of us" (Kashf al-Ghumma Al-Ardabili, pg. 341). In another of their narrations they stated Imam Abu Abdullah said: "Nine tenths (90%) of religion (Shiism) is Taqiyya (dissimulation), hence one who does not dissimulate has no religion" (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.110). So whoever hid among the Ahlus Sunnah of the Shia practice those deceptions just as hypocrites remained in the body of Muslims!!! ET

[78] For instance in long Shia narration which they ascribed to Imam Ja'afar as-Sadiq they stated: The Imam replied, "One must study to find out which one agrees with the laws of the Quran and the Sunnah **and it does not agree with the laws of the those who oppose us**. Such Hadith must be accepted and the one that disagree with the laws of the Quran and the Sunnah and coincides the masses must be disregarded." I said, "May Allah take my soul in the service of your cause, What if both Faqih, scholars of the law would have

deduced and learned their judgment from the book and the Sunnah and found that one of the Hadith agrees with the masses and the other disagrees with the masses which one must be followed?" The Imam replied, **"The one which disagrees with the masses must be followed because in it there is guidance."** I said, "May Allah take my soul in the service of your cause, what if both Hadith would agree with the masses?" The Imam replied, "One must study to find out of the two the one that is more agreeable to their rulers and judges must be disregarded and the other must be followed." I said, "What if both Hadith would agree with their rulers?" The Imam replied, "If such would be the case it must be suspended until you meet your Imam. Restraint in confusing cases is better than indulging in destruction" (al-Kafi, vol. 1, pg. 123-124). So the law in Shiism is always contradict the Ahlus Sunnah who are called in the above narration as "those who oppose us" and the "masses." ET

[79] Qunut, according to the definition of the fuqaha', "is the name of a supplication offered during prayer at a specific point while standing." It is prescribed in Witr prayer after the rukoo' (bowing), according to the more correct of the two scholarly opinions. If a calamity befalls the Muslims, it is prescribed to supplicate Qunut after standing up from bowing position in the last unit of each of the five daily obligatory prayers, until Allah relieves the Muslims of that calamity. (See Tasheeh al-Du'aa' by Shaykh Bakr Abu Zayd, p. 460). ET

With regard to supplicating Qunoot in Fajr prayer all the time, in all circumstances, there is no saheeh report that the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) singled out Fajr for Qunoot, or that he always recited it in Fajr prayer. Rather what is proven is that he (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) said Du'aa' al-Qunoot at times of calamity with words that were appropriate to the situation. He said Du'aa' al-Qunoot in Fajr and in other prayers, praying against Ra'l, Dhakwaan and 'Usayyah for killing the Qur'aan-readers whom the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) had sent to them in order to teach them their religion. And it was proven that he prayed in Fajr prayer and other prayers for the weak and oppressed believers, that Allaah would save them from their enemies. But he did not do that all the time. The Rightly-Guided khaleefahs after him followed the same practice. It is better for the imam to limit Qunoot to times of calamity, following the example of the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), as it was proven that Abu Maalik al-Ash'ari said: "I said to my father, 'O my father, you prayed behind the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) and behind Abubakar, 'Umar, 'Uthman and 'Ali (may Allah be pleased with them). Did they used to say Du'aa' al-Qunoot in Fajr?' He

said, ‘O my son, this is a newly-invented matter.’” (Narrated by the five, apart from Abu Dawood; classed as saheeh by al-Albaani in ‘al-Irwa’, 435). The best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him). (www.islamqa.info/en/20031). ET

[80] Sound hadith has come from the Sunnah concerning reading Bismillah silently in Prayer, for instance: Anas reported: “I observed prayer along with the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) and with Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (may Allah be pleased with all of them), but I never heard any one of them reciting Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim loudly” (Muslim). According to a report narrated by Ahmad (12868), “They did not recite out loud the words ‘*Bismillah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem* (In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful).’” This is the view of the Hanafis and Hanbalis. The Shafi’is differed from them and said that it is Sunnah to recite it out loud, even though the proven Sunnah is not to recite the bismillah out loud. But there is nothing wrong with reciting it out loud, especially if their madhhab is that it is to be recited out loud, so as to soften their hearts. ET

[81] Basically there are three types of recitation of the phrase “*wa arjulakum*” two of which are Mutawatir and the third one is *shaadh* (odd/unreliable):

1. With *Nasb* i.e. *Wa arjulakum*. This is the recitation of Nafe, Ibn Amir, Hafs, Kisai and Yaqoob among the famous reciters of Quran.
2. With *Jarr* i.e. *wa arjulikum*. This is the recitation of Ibn Kathir, Abu Amr, Hamza and Abubakar from Aasim.
3. With *Damma* i.e. *wa arjulukum*. This is attributed to Hasan. This is unreliable. ET

[82] Here are few narrations from Shia sources to show that they are just being pig-headed in rejecting the truth concerning ritual ablution:

(i). Shia muhadith al-Haj Mirza Hussain an-Noore Tabarsi in his (shia book) “Mustadrak al wasail” (1/305-306) narrated: Ali ibn Abu Talib in his message to Mohammad (ibn Abu Bakr) and people of Egypt described them how to perform ablution in this way: Then ablution it’s from perfectness of prayer. Wash your hands 3 times. Then make mazmazah 3 times. And make istinshaq 3 times. And wash your face 3 times. Then your right hand 3 times in the direction of elbow, and your left hand 3 times in the direction of elbow. Then wipe your head. Then wash your right leg 3 times, and then wash your left leg 3 times. And I have seen prophet (s.aw) making ablution in this way.

(ii). Kulayni narrated in Shia book “Kafi” (3/35) that imam Abu Abdullah said: “If you forgot to wipe your head, and washed your feet, then wipe your head and wash your feet (again)”. Bahbude said narration is authentic. Majlisi said it’s muwathaq (reliable).

(iii). Shia scholar Muhammad Baqir al-Majlisi reported in his book “Malathil akhyar” (1/376-377, [Sayyyed Mahdi ar-Raji](#)) from Imam Abu Abdullah (alaihi salam), that he was teaching his companions proper way of ablution, and he said: If (during the ablution) you forgot to wipe your head till you have (already) WASHED YOUR LEGS, then in this case, wipe your head, and then WASH YOUR LEGS. [Grading of hadith by al-Majlisi: Al-Muwathaq. (Reliable). ET

[83] Pilgrimage Mut’ah is called Tamattu and it means performing major pilgrimage (Hajj) separately from the lesser pilgrimage (Umrah) ET

[84] Qiran means combining major pilgrimage with minor pilgrimage and performing them together. ET

[85] Here are some narrations from Shia books forbidding Mut’ah marriage: 1. In Al-Istibsar by Al-Tusi (pg. 689) the following hadith has been recorded: From Mohammad bin Ahmad bin Yahya from Abi Al-Jawza’a from Al-Husain bin Ulwan from Amr bin Khalid from Zaid bin Ali from his fathers from Ali (r.a) that he said; —The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) forbade the meat of the domestic donkey and mut’ah marriages.¶

2. We also find in Al-Kafi (vol. 5, pg. 1095) the following hadith; From Mohammad bin Yahya from Ahmad bin Mohammad from Mu’amar bin Khallad that he said: I asked Abu Al-Hasan Al-Ridha (r.a) about a man getting married to a women in Mut’ah and taking her from country to another country? He said: The other type of marriage is permissible, and this type of marriage isn’t.¶ The Imam means by this statement that the permanent marriage is the only valid marriage in Islam.

3. Ali bin Yaqteen asked Imam Abul Hasan about Mut’ah and he answered: —What is your concern with that? Allah had compensated (given) you with something much better than it (he meant legal marriage)¶ (Furu’ al-Kafi, vol. 2, pg. 43, Wasil Ash-Shia, vol. 14, pg. 449). ET

[86] 'Alqama reported: While I was walking with 'Abdullah at Mina, 'Uthman happened to meet him. He stopped there and began to talk with him. Uthman said to him: Abu 'Abd al-Rahman, should we not marry you to a young girl who may recall to you some of the past of your bygone days; thereupon he said: If you say so, Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: **0 young men, those among you who can support a wife should marry, for it restrains eyes from casting (evil glances). and preserves one from immorality; but those who cannot should devote themselves to fasting for it is a means**

of controlling sexual desire (Muslim). So the commanded whoever cannot be able to marry to keep to voluntary fasting and not to recourse to Mut'ah. ET

[87] Shia scholars are saying the woman in Mut'ah is a hired woman, consider some of their narrations: Zurarah said, "I asked the Imam [i.e., Ja'afar as-Sadiq] with how many girls one can contract mut'ah. He answered: "with as many as one likes. These women are like hired girls" (al-Kafi). A person can do Mut'ah with one thousand women since they are like hired women" (al-Kafi). The narrator asked Imam Baqir about the women of Mut'ah. The Imam replied: —She is not among those four [women classified as wives] because she neither needs a divorce, nor is [a child born of her] entitled to any inheritance. She is like a **hired woman**!! (al-Kafi). These are some of their hadiths on Mut'ah ET

[88] The insincerity, arrogance, rejection of the truth and lies of this Rafidi are very clear for this hadith or something similar to it exist in Shia book of Hadith al-Kafi (vol. 1, pg. 61), in chapter 2: On quality of knowledge, its virtues and the virtues of the scholars. It runs as follows: "Muhammad ibn Yahya has narrated from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn 'Isa from Muhammad ibn Khalid from abu al-Bakhtari from abu 'Abdallah (a.s.) who has said the following." The scholars are the heirs of the prophets because the prophets did not leave any Dirham or Dinar, (units of money) as their legacy. What they left was certain pieces of their statements. Those who acquired anything of these pieces of their statements they have certainly gained a large share. You must be very careful, when acquiring such knowledge, to see from what kinds of people you receive them. Among us the Ahlul Bayt (family of the Prophet) after every one there comes a just person who removes (and exposes) the forgeries of the exaggerators from it (knowledge), the infiltrated materials of the fallacious ones and the interpretations of the ignorant ones." There are other similar hadiths in Shia books but this one suffices for our purpose of exposing the lies of this Rafidi and others like him. ET

[89] The version from Bukhari reads as follows: "Narrated 'Aisha: Fatima sent somebody to Abubakar asking him to give her her inheritance from the Prophet from what Allah had given to His Apostle through Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting). She asked for the Sadaqa (i.e. wealth assigned for charitable purposes) of the Prophet at Medina, and Fadak, and what remained of the Khumus (i.e., one-fifth) of the Khaibar booty. Abubakar said, "Allah's Apostle said, 'We (Prophets), our property is not inherited, and whatever we leave is Sadaqa, but Muhammad's Family can eat from this property, i.e. Allah's property, but they have no right to take more than the food they need.' By Allah! I will not bring any change in dealing with the Sadaqa of the Prophet (and will keep them) as they used to be observed in his (i.e. the Prophet's) life-

time, and I will dispose with it as Allah's Apostle used to do," Then 'Ali said, "I testify that None has the right to be worshipped but Allah, and that Muhammad is His Apostle," and added, "O Abubakar! We acknowledge your superiority." Then he (i.e. 'Ali) mentioned their own relationship to Allah's Apostle and their right. Abubakar then spoke saying, "By Allah in Whose Hands my life is. I love to do good to the relatives of Allah's Apostle rather than to my own relatives" Abubarak added: Look at Muhammad through his family (i.e. if you are not good to his family you are not good to him). ET

[90] There are many transmitted narrations contradicting the Shia Rafidah story: 1. Ali al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, the author of *Kanz al-'Ummal*, has, with reference to al-Khatib al-Baghdadi cited the following narration, the narrator of which is Imam Muhammad al-Baqir: Imam Ja'far narrates from his father, Imam Muhammad al-Baqir: "When Fatimah the daughter of Prophet (s.a.w) passed away, Abubakar and 'Umar came to perform her funeral prayer. Abubakar said to 'Ali: "Go ahead and lead the prayer." He said: "It is unbecoming of me to lead the prayer when you are the successor of Messenger of Allah (s.a.w)." Abubakar hence went forward and led the funeral prayer."

2. Muhibb al-Din al-Tabari has cited the following narration, narrated by Imam Zayn al-'Abidin, in his book *Riyad al-Nadawah fi Manaqib al-'Asharah al-Mubashsharah*: Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq narrates from his father, Imam Muhammad al-Baqir, who narrates from his father, Imam 'Ali Zayn al-'Abidin: "Fatimah passed away between the Maghrib and 'Isha' prayers. Abubakar, 'Umar, 'Uthman, Zubayr and 'Abd al-Rahman ibn 'Awf came for her Salat al-Janazah. Hence 'Ali said to Abubakar: "Go ahead and perform the Salah." He asked: "Whilst you are present here O Abu al-Hasan?" "Yes! Go ahead! For no one besides you, by the oath of Allah, is going to lead the Salah today." Consequently, Abubakar led them in her Salat al-Janazah (May Allah be pleased with them all). She was buried by night."

3. The following narration has been cited by the author of *Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd*: Ibrahim al-Nakha'i has stated that Abubakar led the Salat al-Janazah of Fatimah and recited the takbir four times." There are many more evidence on how Fatima passed away and how the companions conducted her funeral prayer. May Allah protect you and me from the evil creed of Rafida; a creed based on lies, hatred, and enmity to Islam and Muslims. ET

[91] In a long hadith that was narrated by Malik (r.a) the conditions upon which the properties were handed over by Umar (r.a) to Abbas and Ali to manage are stated as follows: "... Then Allah caused Abubakar to die, and I said, 'I am the successor of Allah's Apostle and Abubakar.' So I kept this property in my possession for the first two years of my rule, and I used to do the same with it as Allah's Apostle and Abubakar used to do. Later both of you ('Ali and 'Abbas) came to me with the same claim and the same problem. (O 'Abbas!) You came to me demanding your share from (the inheritance of) the son of your brother, and he ('Ali) came to me demanding his wives share from (the inheritance of) her father. So I said to you, 'If you wish I will hand over this property to you, on condition that you both promise me before Allah that you will manage it in the same way as Allah's Apostle and Abubakar did, and as I have done since the beginning of my rule; otherwise you should not speak to me about it.' So you both said, 'Hand over this property to us on this condition.' And on this condition I handed it over to you. I beseech you by Allah, did I hand it over to them on that condition?" The group said, "Yes." 'Umar then faced 'Ali and 'Abbas and said, "I beseech you both by Allah, did I hand it over to you both on that condition?" They both said, "Yes." 'Umar added, "Do you want me now to give a decision other than that? By Him with Whose permission (order) both the Heaven and the Earth stand fast, I will never give any decision other than that till the Hour is established! But if you are unable to manage it (that property), then return it to me and I will be sufficient for it on your behalf "" (Bukhari).

The properties continued to be managed by Imam Ali (r.a) and his children after him, as has been narrated in another long sound hadith reported by Malik bin 'Aus, as follows: "...So, this property (of Sadaqa) was in the hands of Ali who withheld it from 'Abbas and overpowered him. Then it came in the hands of Hasan bin 'Ali, then in the hands of Husain bin 'Ali, and then in the hands of Ali bin Husain and Hasan bin Hasan, and each of the last two used to manage it in turn, then it came in the hands of Zaid bin Hasan, and it was truly the Sadaqa of Allah's Apostle" (Bukhari). ET

[92] the Holy Prophet (s.a.w) himself remarked concerning Abubakar: "I called people to Islam, everybody thought over it, at least for a while, but this was not the case with Abubakar (r.a), the moment I put Islam before him, he accepted it without any hesitation."

In a hadith narrated by Abu Darda (r.a) the Prophet said concerning Abubakar: "... Allah sent me (as a Prophet) to you (people) but you said (to me), 'You are telling a lie,' while Abubakar said, 'He has said the truth,' and consoled me with himself and his money." He then said twice, "Won't you then give up harming

my companion?" After that nobody harmed Abubakar (among the Prophet companions" (Bukhari). ET

[93] Imam Ali's understanding is that going for Jihad with the Prophet (s.a.w) is better than staying in Madina to oversee it and that is why protested. Consider this hadith: "Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) left 'Ali b. Abi Talib behind him (as he proceeded) to the expedition of Tabuk, whereupon he ('Ali) said: Allah's Messenger, are you leaving me behind amongst women and children? Thereupon he (the Holy Prophet) said: Aren't you satisfied with being unto me what Aaron was unto Moses but with this exception that there would be no prophet after me" (Muslim).

[94] Tharid is an Arabic food which is a dish of sopped bread, meat and broth. ET

[95] Narrated By 'Aisha (The wife of the Prophet): "We set out with Allah's Apostle on one of his journeys till we reached Al-Baida' or Dhatul-Jaish, a necklace of mine was broken (and lost). Allah's Apostle stayed there to search for it, and so did the people along with him. There was no water at that place, so the people went to Abu- Bakr As-Siddiq and said, "Don't you see what 'Aisha has done? She has made Allah's Apostle and the people stay where there is no water and they have no water with them." Abubakar came while Allah's Apostle was sleeping with his head on my thigh, He said, to me: "You have detained Allah's Apostle and the people where there is no water and they have no water with them.

So he admonished me and said what Allah wished him to say and hit me on my flank with his hand. Nothing prevented me from moving (because of pain) but the position of Allah's Apostle on my thigh. Allah's Apostle got up when dawn broke and there was no water. So Allah revealed the Divine Verses of Tayammum. So they all performed Tayammum. Usaid bin Hudair said, "O the family of Abubakar! This is not the first blessing of yours." Then the camel on which I was riding was caused to move from its place and the necklace was found beneath it.

[96] The reasons why the Prophet (s.a.w) objected to that marriage are explained in the following Hadiths; the Prophet said: "Fatima is a part of me and I fear that she may be put to trial in regard to religion. He then made a mention of his son-in law who had been from the tribe of 'Abd Shams and praised his behavior as a son-in-law and said: Whatever he said to me he told the truth and whatever he promised he fulfilled it for me. I am not going to

declare forbidden what is lawful and make lawful what is forbidden, but, by Allah, the daughter of Allah's Messenger and the daughter of the enemy of Allah can never be combined at one place" (Muslim). In another version the Prophet (s.a.w) is reported to have said: " Verily Fatima, the daughter of Muhammad, is a part of me and I do not approve that she may be put to any trial and by Allah, the daughter of Allah's Messenger cannot be combined with the daughter of Allah's enemy (as the co-wives) of one person. Thereupon 'Ali gave up (the idea of his intended) marriage. This hadith has been narrated on the authority of Zuhri with the same chain of transmitters" (Muslim). ET

[97] Qadi Abubakar bin Arabi in his book "Defense against disaster," (pg. 95) quoted the following from the biography of Ibn Asakir: "The first thing which she (Aisha) did when they refused (to stop fighting) was to say, "Oh people! Curse the murderers of `Uthman and their parties." She began to supplicate and the people of Basra shouted out the curse. `Ali heard the invocation and said, "What is this shouting?" They said, "'A'isha is calling and the people of Basra are praying with her against the murderers of `Uthman and their parties." `Ali began to call, "Oh Allah, curse the murderers of `Uthman and their parties!" I said, "The men of right action of both parties shared in cursing the murderers of the Amir al-Mu'minin, the wronged martyr, in the very hour in which the murderers of `Uthman started the battle between the muslim men of right action." ET

[98] The fact is that the Prophet companions did not abandoned Uthman and they did not neglect to defend him and fight the dissents, but he himself asked them not to defend him and thus they are excused for he is the leader and his command is obeyed. In the book titled (as quoted by Qadi Ibn Arabi) 'The Book of the Introduction' by Imam Abu Bakr al-Baqillani (pp. 220-227): "The Companions were innocent of his blood because they did what he wanted and submitted to his opinion when he himself submitted. Beyond what was already said, `Abdullah b. az-Zubayr said to `Uthman, "We are with you in the house as an intelligent group of men who wish to help Allah. Give us permission to fight." He said, "May Allah remind a man who sheds his blood for me." In the 'The History' of at-Tabari (5:128-129), Salit b. Abi Salit said, "'Uthman forbade us to fight them. If he had given us permission, we would have fought them until we had expelled them from there." Ibn Hajar in his book al-Isaba (2:72), wrote: `Abdullah b. `Amir b. Rabi'a said, "I was with `Uthman in the house. He said, "I beg all of those who think that they should obey me to restrain their hands and weapons. The best of you in ability is the one who restrains his hand and weapons." Ibn Kathir said in 'The Beginning and the End' (7:181), "The siege continued from the end of Dhu'l-Qa'da until Friday, the 18th of Dhu'l-Hijja. The day before that, `Uthman spoke to the Muhajirun and the

Ansar who were with him in the house. They were about seven hundred and they included `Abdullah b. `Umar, `Abdullah b. az-Zubayr, al-Hasan and al-Husayn, Marwan and Abu Huraira and a group of his clients. If he had let them, they would have defended him. He said, "I beg whoever owes me obedience to restrain his hands and to go to his house." He said to his friend, "Whoever sheathes his sword is free." So the fighting from the inside cooled down while it was hot on the outside, until Shaytan completed what he had worked for and desired.

In the book 'Iqdul Farid by (pg. 302, vol. 4) by Ahmad bin Abdu rabbuh, Ma'abad al-Khuza'i said: "I met Ali (r.a) after the battle of the camel and said to him: 'I want ask you questions of your behavior and the behavior of Uthman (r.a) and if you are successful today you will be successful in the Hereafter – by the Will of Allah. He replied: 'Ask whatever you want to ask.' I said: 'What station satisfied you when Uthman was killed and you didn't aid him?' He replied: 'surely Uthman is the leader and he has forbidden anybody to fight in his defense saying: 'whoever unsheathes his sword is not part of me.' If we fight in his defense, we have disobeyed him.' I said: 'What station satisfied Uthman for giving up defending himself which led to his being killed?' He replied: 'The station that satisfied the son of Adam (a.s), when he said to his brother: "'If you do stretch your hand against me to kill me, I shall never stretch my hand against you to kill you, for I fear Allah; the Lord of the 'Alamin (mankind, jinns, and all that exists)' (2:28), ... he was patient and that is among the things recommended by Allah." Thus these are some of their excuses for not fighting in defense of Uthman. ET

[99] When the armies of transgressors arrived at Madina with intent of killing Uthman most of the Prophet's companions have dispersed to various nations of the earth teaching Islam, spreading Islam and fighting Jihad at the various war fronts, in the east and the west; in Africa, Egypt, Europe, and deep inside Asia states and most those who are still in Madina have gone to Makka to perform that years pilgrimage. ET

[100] Aisha was not at her home in Madina at that time, for she was at Makka for the pilgrimage of that year. She travelled to Basrah from Makka after the pilgrimage. She travelled to Makka in obedience to Allah and she travelled to Basrah from Makka in what she sees as will bring benefits to all Muslims. ET

[101] It comes in Shia book 'Nahjul Balagah' (pg. 269) that Imam Ali said: "The thing began in this way: We and the Syrians were facing each other while we had common faith in one Allah, in the same Prophet (s) and on the same principles and canons of religion. So far as faith in Allah and the Holy Prophet (s) was concerned we never wanted them (the Syrians) to believe in anything over and above or other than what they were believing in and they did not

want us to change our faith. Both of us were united on these principles. The point of contention between us was the question of the murder of Uthman....”

In another place in the same book (pg. 786) he said concerning abuses and cursing Syrian by his companions: “I dislike you starting to abuse them, but if you describe their deeds and recount their situations that would be a better mode of speaking and a more convincing way of arguing. Instead of abusing them you should say, "O' Allah! save our blood and their blood, produce reconciliation between us and them, and lead them out of their misguidance so that he who is ignorant of the truth may know it, and he who inclines towards rebellion and revolt may turn away from it.”

Mu'awiyah was also reported in “Bidaya wan Nihayah” of Ibn Kathir as saying: “**Ali is better and more virtuous than me** and I differ from him only in the matter of evenging blood of Uthman and if he takes the qisas (retaliation) of the blood of uthmaan I will be the first of the people of Syria to give him allegiance” (al-Bidaya wan Nihayah, page. 129,259 vol. 7). ET

[102] Narrated Usama bin Zaid bin Haritha: Allah's Apostle sent us (to fight) against Al-Huraqa (one of the sub-tribes) of Juhaina. We reached those people in the morning and defeated them. A man from the Ansar and I chased one of their men and when we attacked him, he said, "None has the right to be worshipped but Allah." The Ansari refrained from killing him but I stabbed him with my spear till I killed him. When we reached (Medina), this news reached the Prophet. He said to me, "O Usama! You killed him after he had said, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah?'" I said, "O Allah's Apostle! He said so in order to save himself." The Prophet said, "You killed him after he had said, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah.'" The Prophet kept on repeating that statement till I wished I had not been a Muslim before that day” (Bukhari). ET

Narrated Ibn Abbas: Regarding the Verse: “And say not to anyone who offers you peace (by accepting Islam), You are not a believer.” There was a man amidst his sheep. The Muslims pursued him, and he said (to them) "Peace be on you." But they killed him and took over his sheep. Thereupon Allah revealed in that concern, the above Verse up to:-- "...seeking the perishable good of this life” (4.94). (i.e. those sheep). (Bukhari). ET

[103] They have mentioned that `Amr bin Al-`As went to visit Musailamah the liar after the Messenger of Allah was commissioned (as a Prophet) and before `Amr had accepted Islam. Upon his arrival, Musailamah said to him, “What has been revealed to your friend (Muhammad) during this time” `Amr said, “A short and concise Surah has been revealed to him.” Musailamah then said, “What is it” `Amr replied: “By Al-`Asr (The time) Verily, man is in loss. Except those who

believe and do righteous deeds, and recommend one another to the truth, and recommend one another to patience.” So Musailamah thought for a while. Then he said, “Indeed something similar has also been revealed to me.” `Amr asked him, “What is it” He replied, “O Wabr* (a small, furry mammal; hyrax), O Wabr! You are only two ears and a chest, and the rest of you is digging and burrowing.” Then he said, “What do you think, O `Amr” So `Amr said to him, “By Allah! Verily, you know that I know you are lying.” (Tafsir Ibn Kathir). ET

[104] In hadith studies, Isra'iliyyat (اسرائيليات "of the Israelites") is the body of narratives originating from Jewish and Christian traditions, rather than from other well-accepted sources that quote the Islamic prophet Muhammad. Generally the Judeo-Christian traditions found in the early Islamic literature follow the following patterns.

1- They invariably aim at hair-splitting and venture into unnecessary details with no real lesson or point of reproof e.g. the dimensions of Noah's Ark.

2- Quite often they go against reason and venture into realms of fiction and thus we find a startling similarity between them and the Biblical or Apocryphal narratives e.g. details of the episode of David, may Allah bless him, killing Goliath (Jalut).

3- Many of them constitute blasphemy against the great Prophets, at least by Islamic standards. In fact no reasonable person will dare to attribute that kind of things to the Messengers of the Almighty e.g. Prophet David, may Allah bless him, going after Uriah's wife.

4- Almost invariably within the Islamic rubric their sources are the people who reverted to Islam from Jewish or Christian religions and then narrated what they had heard from the popular legends of their ancestors. (www.letsturnthetables.com) ET

[105] Shia Rafida believed that the consensus of the companions is not a proof or evidence in law, but yet they employ it to support their creed. ET

[106] ISTIRJA استرجاع Lit. “Returning.” A term used for the act of appealing to Allah for help in the time of affliction and calamity by repeating the following ejaculation from the Qur'an, Chapter 2, verse: 150: inna li'llahi was inna ilaihi raji'un, “Verily, we belong to God, and verily we shall return to God.” ET

[107] Battle of Ḥarra is the fighting that took place between the Syria army under the commandership of Muslim bin 'Uqba and the people of Medina who rose against Yazid bin Mu'awiya. In 63/682, the people of Medina rose against

the rule of Yazid bin Mu'awiya under the leadership of 'Abdullah bin Hanzala. Harra is a place outside Madina. ET

[108] Here are some Shia beliefs about the Imams – elevating them above Prophets and Messengers of Allah. It well known in the religion of Islam that whoever elevated anybody above Prophets is an unbeliever even if he didn't call the one he elevated a Prophet: Shia Muhaddith al-Hurr al-'Amili has a chapter in his book "al-Fusoul al-Muhimmah fi Usoul al-A'imah" vol.1 pg.403 called: "chapter 101: The Prophet and the twelve Imams (as) are better than all other creations from prophets and past successors and angels, and that the prophets are better than the angels." Then he mentioned two narrations in it to prove this.

Ibn Babaweih al-Saduq mentioned in his book "Uyoun Akhbar al-Rida" vol.1 pg.262 a chapter titled: "The superiority of the prophet and the Imams over all angels and prophets (as)."

al-Sayyed Amir Muhammad Kadhimi al-Qazwini says in his book "al-Shia fi 'Aqa'idihim wa Ahkamihim" mentions the title of this chapter on pg.73: [The Imams of Ahlul-Bayt (as) are better than the prophet (as) according to the text of the Qur'an].

Grand Ayatullah Mirza Jawad al-Tabrizi answers a question posed to him in "al-Anwar al-Ilahiyyah fil-Masa'il al-'Aqa'idhiyyah" pg.179:

[Question: Are the Imams superior to the prophets except our messenger (SAWS)? And what is the proof?

Answer: In his name the most high: Our Imams are better than the prophets except for our Prophet (SAWS), Allah knows best.]

Grand Ayatullah Ruhullah al-Khomeini says in "al-Hukuma al-Islamiyyah" pg.47: [It is from the necessities of our Madhab, that our Imams have a rank that no angel or prophet can reach.]

www.youpuncturedtheark.wordpress.com)

From the Shia site www.ismailignosis.com/2012/08/15/the-eternal-imam-songs-of-krishna-sermons-of-ali/ we have the following elevation of Imam to god: Imam Ali bin Abi Talib said: "I am the Sign of the All-Powerful. I am the Gnosis of the Mysteries. I am the Threshold of Thresholds. I am the companion of the radiance of the divine Majesty. I am the First and the Last, the Manifest and the Hidden. I am the Face of God. I am the mirror of God, the supreme Pen, the Tabula secreta." (Khuṭbah al-Bayān).

Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, said: "Indeed, Allah created us and formed us, and gave us the most perfect form. He made us His Eye over His Servants, and His Speaking Tongue, through which He speaks to His Servants. We are His Open

Hand, extended with Mercy and Kindness to His Servants. We are His Face, through which He is reached, and the Gate which indicates upon Him. We are His reservoir in the heavens and Earth. Through us, the trees grow and the fruits are ripened. Through us the rivers flow, and through us the succor of the skies comes down. We plant the grasses of the Earth. Through our worship, Allah is worshipped. If it were not for us, Allah would not be worshipped.” (al-Kulayni, Usūl al-Kāfi, 1:144).

In fact the Twelve Shia Rafida scholar al-Mamqani stated that: **“What our predecessors (early Shia scholars) considered as Ghulu (extremism) has in our current times become from the necessities of the Madhab (Shia creed)”**(Tanqeeh al-Maqal fi ‘Ilm al-Rijal 3/240).

Another Shia Rafida scholar Mirza Musa Ihqaqi Ishue’l sated in his book titled Ihqaqul Haq: “And from them is al-Sayyed ‘Ali Bahr al-‘Uloom in his book “al-Burhan al-Kat’i” vol.2 pg.435 at the end of the page he said: They are unbelievers those who believe that the Imams can create, bestow wealth, revive, kill, generally with the permission and support of Allah and his will. **The condition today is that they are from the necessities of the creed of the Shia Imamiyyah Shia, that the Imams can do anything with the permission of Allah and his support and will.”** ET

[109] Here are some hadith concerning sending blessings to the Prophet (s.a.w) and his family. When he was asked how to send blessings to him he replied to them; say: “O Allah, send prayers upon Muhammad and upon the family of Muhammad, as You sent prayers upon Ibrahim and upon the family of Ibrahim; You are indeed Worthy of Praise, Full of Glory. O Allah, send blessings upon Muhammad and upon the family of Muhammad as You sent blessings upon Ibrahim and upon the family of Ibrahim; You are indeed Worthy of Praise, Full of Glory)” (Bukhari, Muslim). When the Prophet was asked on how to supplicate to him he said: “O Allah, send Your salah (grace, honor and mercy) upon Muhammad and upon his wives and offspring, as You sent Your salah upon Ibrahim, and send Your blessings upon Muhammad and upon his wives and offspring, as You sent Your blessings upon the family of Ibrahim. You are indeed Praiseworthy, Most Glorious).” (Bukhari, Muslim). ET

[110] According to Shia hadith after the Messenger of Allah said: **“I am leaving for you two weighty things...”** He was asked; **“Who are members of your family?”** He replied: **“The family of Ali, The family of Ja’afar, the family of Aqil, and the family of Abbas”** (Amali, by Saduq, pgs. 77-79 and Bihar Anwar, vol. 45, pg. 101). And those are the Bani Hashim and the Shia hated

Bani Hashim, and all scholars and religious men of Bani Hashim love and supports Abubakar and Umar.

Here are more Shia hadiths on this issue: Zaid bin Arqam (R.A) says, the Messenger of Allah said: "Surely, I am leaving among you two weighty things; the first of them is the Book of Allah. Then he said: and members of my household. Hissain asked him: "Who are members of his household O Zaid? Aren't his wives members of his household? He replied: His wives are members of his household and those to whom giving the poor due (Zakkat - charity) to is forbidden (both during his life time) and after him. He asked: Who are they? He replied the family of Ali, the family of Aqil, the family of Ja'afar, and the family of Abbas. He asked: All of those are forbidden charity? He replied: Yes" (Bihar Anwar, vol. 23, pg. 114).

During the terminal illness of the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W), he heard the sound of weeping and asked: "Who are those (weeping)." They (who are present) replied: "The Ansar." He asked: "Who are here (present) among members of my household?" They replied: "Ali and Abbas." So he called them and went out (to meet the Ansar) leaning on them..." (al – Ihtijaj, pg. 43, Bihar Anwar).

On the authority of Salman al – Farisi (R.A) who said: "I was sitting in the company of the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) in the mosque, and Abbas bin Abdilmutallib came in and made salutation. The messenger of Allah replied to his salutation and welcomed him. Then he (Abbas) said: "O Messenger of Allah, with what is Ali made more preferable among us, members of the household and our root is the same?" The Messenger of Allah said: "Then I will tell you O uncle..." (Bihar Anwar, vol. 43, pg. 17).

On the authority of Imam Baqir who said: "When the Messenger of Allah commanded Abbas to blockade their doors (that opened into the Mosque), and allowed Ali to leave his own door. Abbas come along with other members of Muhammad's (S.A.W) family and said: "O Messenger of Allah! Why is Ali allowed to enter and go out? The Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) replied: „That is for Allah, so accept His decision.”" (Bihar Anwar, vol. 33, pg. 439, Tafsir al – Askari, pg. 20). In this context whom do he mean by the phrase: "...Abbas come along with other members of Muhammad's (S.A.W) family...?"

During the battle of Badr when Shaibah bin Abdulmutallib was killed the Messenger of Allah says with regard to him: "He is the first martyr from members of my household" (Tafsir al – Qummi, vol.2, pg. 264, Bihar Anwar, vol. 19, pg. 225). ET

[\[111\]](#) Shia Rafida usually refer to themselves as "the special (al-Khassah)," and the Ahlus Sunnah as "the generality (al-'Ammah)." ET

[112] Consider the following Shia hadiths and statements: In it, we find the following Shia Hadith: "The Imams possess all the knowledge granted to the angels, prophets, and messengers." (Al-Kulaini, Al-Kafi, p.255) Another narration in Al-Kafi says: "Signs of the prophets are possessed by the Imams." (Al-Kafi, p.231)

Allamah Baqir Al-Majlisi says about the Imams: "Their preference [is] over the prophets and all the people." (Bihar Al-Anwar, Vol 26, Chapter 6) He further stated: "...our Imams are higher [and] better than the rest of the prophets... they are more knowledgeable than the prophets...this is the main opinion of the Imami (Shia), and is only rejected by one who is ignorant about the traditions." (Bihar Al-Anwar, Volume 26, p.297). Shia scholar al-Majlisi stated: On the whole, after admission of the fact that the Imams are not prophets, we are bound to acknowledge the fact that they are superior to all Prophets and Awsiya (legatees) except our Prophet (salutations and peace upon him and his family). To our knowledge there is no reason not to describe the Imams as Prophets except consideration to the status of the Final Prophet. Our intellect too, cannot perceive a distinction between Nabuwwah (prophethood) and Imamah. (Source: Bihar Al-Anwar, Volume 26, p.82).

Hasan b. Abbas once asked Imam al-Rida, peace be upon him, in a letter. "What is the difference between a messenger, a prophet, and an Imam?" The Imam answered as follows: "The messenger (rasul) is a person to whom Jibril descends and who both sees him and hears the words that he speaks. He is thus in communication with divine revelation (wahy), which he sometimes receives in the form of a dream, as was the case with Ibrahim, peace be upon him. The prophet (nabiyy) sometimes hears the words spoken by Jibril and at other times sees him without hearing anything from him. **The Imam hears the words that Jibril utters without seeing him**" (Al-Kulaynee, Al-Kaafi, vol. 1, pg. 176).

So in Shia Rafida, Ithna Ashariyyah creed: Imamah is an article of faith and the Imam is infallible, he is appointed by Allah just like Prophets, he must be obeyed, he is better than all Prophets and Messengers and he receives revelations from Angel Gabriel without seeing him. Thus, Imams are prophets only the name is changed for they do all the functions of Prophets and Messengers of Allah and they are better than them. Consider the summary of the above Shia hadith between a Messenger (Rasul), Prophet (Nabi), and Imam (in some of their hadiths they call him Muhaddath): **Messengers:** They see & hear the angel whether they are asleep or awake. **Prophets:** They see & hear the angel while asleep, but when they are awake they can only hear. **Imams:** They can ONLY hear the reports, but they DO NOT see the angel whether they are asleep or awake. ET

[113] If this statement is sound then it is talking about an ordinary personal legatee that is not related with politics or Imamah and religious leadership. ET

[114] Part of the hadith of the comparison which was made after the battle of Badr is: "Turning to Abubakar who had counselled a lenient view, the Holy Prophet said: "Abubakar you are like Abraham who said, 'He who follows me is one of us, and he who disobeys me, then O God, You are gracious enough to forgive'. And Abubakar you are also like Jesus who said, 'If you punish them they are Your servants, and if You forgive them, You are All Powerful, Mighty and Wise.'" Turning to Umar, the Holy Prophet said: Umar, you are like Noah who said, 'O God, do not leave on the earth a single unbeliever.' And Umar you are also like Moses who said, 'O God destroy their properties and harden their hearts so that they are not converted till they have suffered punishment" (Musnad Ahmad). ET

[115] Immediately after his return from Hudabiya, Prophet Muhammad had the six letters of invitation to Islam that he had dictated to his scribes sent with emissaries to the prominent heads of state of the time (Muharram/May 628). The Prophet's letter of invitation to Chosroes II (Parvez) was entrusted to 'Abd Allah ibn Hudafa al-Sahmi for delivery. Dihyah ibn Khalifah al-Kalbi was appointed as emissary to Byzantine Emperor Heraclius. The third letter was sent with 'Amr ibn Umayya ad-Damri to the Negus Asham, King of Abyssinia. The fourth letter was delivered by Khatib ibn Abi Balta'a to the Byzantine Empire's Governor General of Egypt, Muqawqis (Jurayj ibn Mina). The fifth letter was sent with Shuja' ibn Wahb to the Ghassanid King, Harith ibn abi Shimr. The sixth letter was delivered by Salit ibn 'Amr to the chief of the Banu Hanafi in Yamama, Hawdha ibn 'Ali. Prophet Muhammad sent these letters with the purpose of conveying the message of Islam to many tribal leaders and sometimes even to individuals living in various parts of the Arabian Peninsula. This is just a little example and all of the emissaries are his companions and not members of his family or Ali bin Abi Talib.

Immediately after the Uhud battle, a group of men from Adal and al-Qarah came to Muhammad; requested him to send with them a few instructors to teach Islam to their people who had embraced Islam. Muhammad agreed to this, and promptly sent six men (or ten men as per Ibn Sa'ad) with them. . Among the six missionaries selected by Muhammad was Asim bin Thabit, who was appointed the head of this delegation. That is what is called in Islamic history as the episode of al-Raji. It is also well known that the Prophet (s.a.w) appointed many of his companions to lead army detachments for various war efforts and to various fronts. ET

[116] It was narrated from Ibn 'Abbas that the Prophet (s.a.w) acquired his word Zulfiqar on the day of Badr and this is the one that he saw in a dream on the

day of Uhud. It was narrated by al-Tirmidhi (1561) and Ibn Majah (2808) and classed as hasan by al-Albaani in Saheeh Ibn Maajah. The phrase translated here as “acquired” means he took it in addition to his share of the booty.

Ahmad (2441) narrated – in a report classed as hasan by al-Arna’oot – a more complete account, in which the dream is described:

“It was narrated that Ibn ‘Abbas said: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.) acquired his sword Zulfiqar day of Badr, and it is the one concerning which he saw a dream on the day of Uhud. He said: “I saw that my sword Zulfiqar was blunted and I interpreted that as some loss that would affect you. And I saw myself with a ram riding behind me and I interpreted that ... ; and I saw myself wearing a strong coat of chain-mail and I interpreted that as Madina. And I saw cattle being slaughtered, and by Allah what good cattle they are, by Allah what good cattle they are.” What the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said came to pass. The sword of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was called Zulfiqar because it had fine and beautiful engraving on it and engraving may be called fiqrah in Arabic. This was the most famous of his swords. (www.islamqa.com) ET

[117] An Iraqi former Shia Scholar Sheikh al-Mayyad wrote: “Undoubtedly among the proofs that are affirming the total negation of Shia hypothesis of Imamah and legatee and which their scholars are claiming to be a continuation of Prophethood is the words of Allah the Exalted: “On the Day when Allah will gather the Messengers together and say to them: “What was the response you received (from men to your teaching)? They will say: “We have no knowledge, verily, only You are the AllKnower of all that is hidden (or unseen, etc.)” (5:109). The verse has confined, restricted and directed its question to only the Prophets, so if to say that the Prophets have legatees or there are Imams (leaders) who have been appointed by Allah to succeed the Prophets or that there are some legatees or appointees who are considered as continuation of Prophethood, the question would not have been confined and restricted to the Prophets only, it would have been imperative to also ask the Imams. This is because according to Shia claims and premises the Imam are carrying out all the Divine responsibilities of Prophets by Allah’s command. This demand is authoritative especially if the Noble verse purpose of asking the question is to know the condition of their communities after them. In this instance it is better and more befitting to ask the Imams who were appointed by Allah as a continuation of Prophethood and because they are the ones who will continue to shoulder all the responsibilities of the Prophets as per the above mentioned claim. This is how we arrived at the fact that the above verse is one of the proofs that negated the concepts of Imamah and legatee as being championed by the proponents of Shia creed” (www.almoaiyad.com/mqalat).

And I –the translator- say, it also showed that only Prophets are authorities of Allah for they are the only ones to be questioned concerning their followers and delivery of the Message. **Allah said: "... So believe in Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad), the Prophet who can neither read nor write, who believes in Allah and His Words, and follow him so that you may be guided" (7:158).** ET

[118] Shia Rafida also gives to Ali (r.a) attributes and characteristics of Allah the Exalted, for example Allah Said in the Qur'an that He is: "The Only Owner (and the Only Ruling Judge) of the Day of Recompense (the Day of Judgment) (1:4). But the Shia Imamiyyah Rafida are saying that on that Day Ali (r.a) will be: "The distributor of Heaven and Hell" (Bihar Anwar). This distribution will be based on love of Ali or hatred of him, according to Shia Rafida and not on believe in Allah, His Messenger and working righteous deeds as stated and demanded by the Qur'an in many verses and Sunnah of His Messenger. ET

[119] The word of piety is "LA ILAHA ILLAL LAH, MUHAMMAD RASULULLAH" and not Ali Bin Abi Talib. Allah the Most High said in the Qur'an: "**When those who disbelieve had put in their hearts pride and haughtiness the pride and haughtiness of the time of ignorance, then Allah sent down His Sakinah (calmness and tranquility) upon His Messenger (SAW) and upon the believers, and made them stick to the word of piety (i.e. none has the right to be worshipped but Allah), and they were well entitled to it and worthy of it. And Allah is the All-Knower of everything" (48:26).** Thus this hadith is fabricated to anyone who has little knowledge of the science of hadith, it is forbidden to ascribe it to the infallible Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). We did not know anybody who is the flag of guidance and the leader of friends of those who fear Allah other than the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). ET

[120] What the Sheikh has stated could be proven from Shia books, for example: In Nahjul balagah, sermon no. 216, Ali (R.A) said: "**...As I am not above making mistakes in my actions.**" In Bihar al – Anwar, vol. 25, pg. 207, Ja'afar as – Sadiq said; "**Surely we commit sins, do wrong and then repent to Allah.**" ET

[121] Compare what Abubakar said above and what Ali said from Shia sources: "In Nahjul balagah, sermon no. 216, Ali (R.A) said: "**...As I am not above making mistakes in my actions.**" In Bihar al – Anwar, vol. 40, pg. 199, Ali said: "**My Lord, how can I invoke You after I have disobeyed You.**" In Raudat al –Kafi, pg. 293 Ali said: "**Don't stop telling me the truth or giving me a just advice, for I am not in myself above making mistakes and I have no guarantee on that with regard to my conduct.**" In the book Amali by Tusi, pgs. 518 and 566, Ali said: "**If I tell the truth confirm me and if I**

speak wrongly correct me for I am a man like you.” This proved to you that Shia Rafida are as described by the Qur’an: “And say: “Are our aliha (gods) better or is he Jesus?” They quoted not the above example except for argument. Nay! But they are a quarrelsome people” (43:58). ET

[122] A former Shia Scholar Ayatullah Borqei quoting widely from Shia sources such as Nahjul Balagah made the following thesis: If there is any legal text with regard to the leadership and successorship of Ali or any of his children, he would not have shown his hatred (reservations), avoidance, and shunning taking over the responsibility of leadership as we have seen in his sermons: **“Leave me alone and seek for someone else...If you leave me then I am the same as you are. It is possible I would listen and obey whomever you make in charge of your affairs. I am better for you as a counselor than as a chief.”** In another occasion he said: **“You advanced towards me shouting; „allegiance,” „allegiance,” like a She-camel having delivered newly born young. I held back my hand but you pulled it towards you, I draw back my hand but you dragged it...”** Imam Ali (a.s) also said: **“By Allah I had no liking for the Caliphate, nor any interest in government but yourselves invited me to it and prepared me for it...”** Imam Ali also would not have said: **“Verily I did not seek for people, but they sought for me and I didn’t give them vow of allegiance but they gave me their vows of allegiance...”** His hatred for leadership and display of his avoidance of it was so great to the extent of saying: **“...This (taking responsibility of leadership) is brackish water and a morsel that chokes the throat of whoever swallows it.”** It was also narrated in Sharh Nahjul Balagah (commentary to peak of eloquence), by Ibn Abi Hadid that Imam Ali said: **“Surely, Allah knows from His Heavens and His Throne that I undoubtedly was hating successorship over the community of Muhammad, until when you have a consensus of opinion over that.”** Therefore based on this, if Allah has appointed Imam Ali (a.s) to be the leader and the successor of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w), he will assuredly not utter the above words or anything similar to them, in the contrast he will have claimed it and state unequivocally that; I and my children are those vested with authority by Allah (after the Messenger of Allah). Therefore those who made these claims are those who fabricated narrations (hadiths and distorted the meaning of verses of the Qur’an so that it comply with there views); these are the type of people whom the maxim, “they are more than the king himself,” suited perfectly” (critique of the book al-Kafi). And again the same argument can be used against Imam Hasan: If his leadership is correct and is by Divine appointment; then his handing over to Mu’awiyah is an act of disobedience to Allah. Shia are but quarrelsome people. ET

[123] Consider this sermon from the Shia book 'Nahjul Balagh,' sermon No. 91, where they said Imam Ali said: "Leave me and seek some one else. We are facing a matter which has (several) faces and colors, which neither hearts can stand nor intelligence can accept. Clouds are hovering over the sky, and faces are not discernible. You should know that if I respond to you I would lead you as I know and would not care about whatever one may say or abuse. **If you leave me then I am the same as you are. It is possible I would listen to and obey whomever you make in charge of your affairs. I am better for you as a counselor than as chief.**"

Compare the above sermon to what they are accusing Abubakar, you will find that they are just quarrelsome people. One will be forced to ask Shia: Where is Divine appointment of Ali in the above sermon? ET

[124] It has come in Shia books that Imam Ali has burnt Shia extremist who said that he is god: "From Hisham bin Salim who said: I heard from Abu 'Abdullah who said: "Abdullah bin Saba' called (to people) to the lordship/divinity of Ali Bin Abi Talib. So he (Abu Abdullah) said: That Imam Ali ordered him to repent, but he refused. Then Ali let him burn in fire" (Al-Kashee, Rijaal Al-Kashee, pg. 107, hadeeth # 171). In another Shia hadith it is stated: "A group came to Ali bin Abi Talib and they said to him: "Assalamu Alaika (Peace be upon you), O our Lord (rabana)! So he asked for their repentance, but they did not repent. So he dug a ditch for them and lit a fire in it and dug a ditch to its other side and conveyed between them. So when they did not repent he threw them in the ditch and lit in the other ditch until they died." (Al-Kulaini, Al-Kafi, vol. 7, pg. 258-259, hadeeth # 18). This is another Shia hadith on the issue of burning people with fire: On the authority of 'Abdullah Ibn Maimun who reported from Ja'far Al-Sadiq: "Khalid (Ibn Al-Walid) wrote to Abu Bakr: "Peace be upon you. I have been informed with clear evidence of a man that has been indulged in sodomy. Abubakar consulted the companions who said: "Kill him (i.e. the sodomite)."

He (i.e. Abu Bakr) then consulted the Chief of The Believers 'Ali ibn Abi Talib who said: "Burn him (i.e. the sodomite) with fire, for killing alone means nothing to the Arabs (it's not severe enough)." 'Othman said: "What do you say [O Abu Bakr]?" He (i.e. Abu Bakr) said: "I will go with what Ali has said, burn him (i.e. the "homosexual) with fire." So he (i.e. Abu Bakr) wrote back to Khalid ordering him to burn the 'homosexual' with fire." [sources and references: Al-Sahih min Sirah Al-Imam Ali ('Authentic reports from the life of Imam Ali') by Ja'far Murtada Al-'Amili, vol. 11, p. 336. Also in Al-Mahasin, p. 112, Wasa'il Al-Shia, vol. 28, p. 160 and vol. 18, p. 421. In Mustadrak Al-Wasa'il, vol. 18, p. 79. In Bihar Al-Anwar vol. 76, p. 69 and other many other Shia sources]. So

according to Shia sources it is Ali who advised Abubakar to burn a homosexual and here they are quarrelling over smoke without fire. ET

[125] It was narrated that Abu Mas'ud al-Ansari said: The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: "The people should be led in prayer by the one who has most knowledge of the Book of Allah; if they are equal in knowledge of the Qur'an, then by the one who has most knowledge of the Sunnah" (Muslim). The Prophet (s.a.w) more deserved to follow his teaching and lead by example and thus shamed Shia Rafidah. ET

[126] Here are samples of Imam Ali (r.a) curses on his party and praying to Allah against them from Shia Rafidah books: "...Ali replied: O Abu Maryam, I am still the same person you have known, but **I am tried with the most wicked people on the face of earth. I call them, and they don't follow me, and if I budge to what they want they disperse away from me?**" ((Al-Gharaat, Ibn Hilal al-Thaqafi, p.44). From Nahjul Balagah he said: "...Even if I give you charge of a wooden bowl I fear you would run away with its handle. **O' my Allah they are disgusted of me and I am disgusted of them. They are weary of me and I am weary of them. Change them for me with better ones and change me for them with worse one. O' my Allah melt their hearts as salt melts in water.** By Allah I wish I had only a thousand horsemen of Banu Firas ibn Ghanm (as the poet says): If you call them the horsemen would come to you like the summer cloud (thereafter Imam Ali alighted from the pulpit)!! (Sermon No. 25). In another sermon in Nahjul Balagah he said: "...O you semblance of men, not men, your intelligence is that of children and your wit is that of the occupants of the curtained canopies (women kept in seclusion from the outside world). **I wish I had not seen you nor known you. By Allah, this acquaintance has brought about shame and resulted in repentance.** May Allah fight you! You have filled my heart with pus and loaded my bosom with rage. You made me drink mouthful of grief one after the other. **You shattered my counsel by disobeying and leaving me** so much so that Quraysh started saying that the son of Abi Talib is brave but does not know (tactics of) war. May Allah bless them! Is any one of them fiercer in war and older in it than I am? I rose for it although yet within twenties, and here I am, have crossed over sixty, but one who is not obeyed can have no opinion!! (Sermon No. 27).

[127] Consider what Shia said Ali (r.a) told Uthman in their book Nahjul Balagah (Sermon no. 163): "When people went to Amir al-mu'minin in a deputation and complained to him through what they had to say against `Uthman, and requested him to speak to him on their behalf and to admonish him for their sake, he went to see him and said: 'The people are behind me and they have made me an ambassador between you and themselves; but by Allah, I do not

know what to say to you. I know nothing (in this matter) which you do not know, nor can I lead you to any matter of which you are not aware. You certainly know what we know, we have not come to know anything before you which we could tell you; nor did we learn anything in secret which we should convey to you. You have seen as we have seen and you have heard as we have heard. You sat in the company of the Prophet of Allah as we did. (Abu Bakr) Ibn Abi Quhafah and (‘Umar) ibn al-Khattab were no more responsible for acting righteously than you, since you are nearer than both of them to the Prophet of Allah through kinship, and you also hold relationship to him by marriage which they do not hold.”

In the above statement of Imam Ali he said; 1. He has no special knowledge that he can tell Uthman. 2. He praised Abubakar and Umar for their good conduct and justice. 3. He spoke about Uthman’s kinship with the Prophet (s.a.w) and his being his in law. All these statements nullify Shia beliefs and assumptions. ET

[128] (a) This incident happened on a Thursday, and the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) died on the following Monday, i.e., four days later. He could have asked others to write that document, but because he (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) did not do that, we know that it was not revelation that he could have concealed.

(b) Allah, may He be exalted, praised His Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) for having conveyed what He revealed to him, and Allah, may He be exalted, reminded this ummah of the blessing that He had bestowed upon them by perfecting their religion and completing His favour upon them. The idea that what the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) did not write was part of the religion that all of the ummah needs is tantamount to accusing the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) of not conveying the message, and it constitutes disbelief in what the Lord, may He be exalted, said about the religion being perfected and His blessing being completed upon His slaves (www.islamqa.com).

Again it is a duty of everybody present to bring the ink and paper and this includes Ali. Abul Abbas Qurtubi said: With regard to the words “Come, let me write for you a document after which you will not go astray”, this is a command and a request that was addressed to everyone present. ET

[129] In a similar hadith, Qais bin 'Ubad reported: We said to 'Ammar: Was your fighting (on the side of 'Ali in the Battle of Siffin) a matter of your own choice or you got its hints from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) for it, is

likely for one to err in one's own discretion or was it because of any covenant that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) got from you? He said: It was not because of any covenant that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) got from us which he did get from other people..." (Muslim).

[130] The principle of consultation to choose a leader in Islam was maintained by members of the Prophet's family and progeny for instance:

1. Shia Imamiyyah reported from Ali (A.S) as it came in the book, Nahjul balagah: **"Verily, those who made the oath of allegiance to Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (R.A) have sworn allegiance to me. Now (those) who were present at the election have no right to go back against their oath of allegiance and those who were absent on the occasion have no right to oppose it. And so far as consultation is concerned (to select a leader) it was limited to the Muhajirin and Ansar and whomsoever they selected become the leader (Imam) as per approval and pleasure of Allah. If somebody goes against such decision with criticism or innovation (Bid'at), then he should be persuaded to adopt the course followed by others, and if he refuses to fall in line with others, then war is the only course left open to adopt against him because he has refused to follow the course followed by the believers...."**

The above letter also appeared in the book titled Waq'atus Siffin, written by Nasr bin Muzahim al-Minqiri who died in 212 A.H, and it is one of the oldest, accepted books to the Shia Imamiyyah, which was printed in Iran recently. The above quoted letter is in agreement with the glorious Qur'an where Allah says in the chapter on Taubah (repentance): **"And the first to lead the way of the Muhajirin and Ansar, and those who follow them in goodness – Allah is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him, and He hath made ready for them Gardens underneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is, the Supreme triumph" (9:100).**

It shall be noted that the Muhajirin and Ansar have been promised Paradise in this glorious verse with all clarity. Allah also said about them: **"...Whose affairs are a matter of counsel" (45:38).**

Thus, if a group of people of the denizen (occupants) of Paradise meet, consult among themselves and selected a person as the leader of the Muslims, does that action contradict the pleasure and approval of Allah? Or is it as Imam Ali said: **"... (that is in accordance to) the pleasure and approval of Allah?"**

2. When the commander of the faithful Uthman bin Affan (R.A) was murdered in cold blood the rebels came to Ali (R.A) asking him to take over authority but he refused saying to them: **"This is not of your power, this is for the Muhajirin and Ansar, whoever they chose as a leader will be the leader**

“(Tabari). When the Muhajirin and Ansar asked him to be the leader, he replied them saying: “Leave me alone and look for another person... I would be most obedient and loyal to anyone you chose to conduct your affairs, for me to be your vizier (adviser) is better for you than to be your leader” (Nahjul balagah, Tabari). It was reported that he offered the leadership to Talha (R.A), then to Zubair (R.A) and both did not accept it. Thereafter he said to the Muhajirin and Ansar; vows will be taken in the Mosque and not in secret. That has been the conduct and behavior of Imam Ali (R.A) throughout his life for before his death people requested him to name someone as his successor but he refused and when they suggested Hasan (R.A) he replied: **“...I do not command you, nor prevent you, you understand better your affairs” (al-Shafi, vol. 3, pg. 295 by Murtada).**

3. Wiki Shia web site mentioned the terms for peace treaty between Hasan and mu'awiyah as follows: —Thus, he (Imam Hasan) wrote: This is the peace treaty between Hasan bin Ali and Mu'awiya bin Abi Sufyan. I declare peace between us and hand the Caliphate on to him on condition that:

- * He (Mu'awiya) would act according to God's book and prophet's Sunnah and the method (tradition) of four first Caliphs.

- * He would not pass anyone as his successor, and after his death the Caliphate should be dealt with by a council of Muslims (shura).

- * People living everywhere should feel safe about their lives, their properties, and their offspring.

- * Mu'awiya should not conspire any riots against Hasan or threaten any of his friends.

'Abdullah bin al-Harith and 'Amr bin Salama are witnesses to this treaty.

So if you understand the above stand by Imam Ali and Hasan; that choosing a leader is by consultation between Muslims and then you will understand that it is not by Divine appointment. In the above conditions there is mention of following the conduct of the first four Caliphs! By these you will understand that Shia are people given to argumentation in falsehood. ET

[\[131\]](#) Ali has made similar statement in the book of Shia Nahjul balagah: “Verily, those who made the oath of allegiance to Abubakar, Umar and Uthman (R.A) have sworn allegiance to me. Now (those) who were present at the election have no right to go back against their oath of allegiance and those who were absent on the occasion have no right to oppose it. And so far as consultation is concerned (to select a leader) it was limited to the Muhajirin and Ansar and whomsoever they selected become the leader (Imam) as per approval and pleasure of Allah. If somebody goes against such decision with criticism or innovation (Bid'ah), then he should be persuaded to adopt the course followed by others, and if he refuses to fall in line with others, then war is the only

course left open to adopt against him because he has refused to follow the course followed by the believers....” (Nahjul Balagha, pg. 166). ET

[132] It come on page 164 of English translation of the Shia book Nahjul Balagah that: “[Ash'ath bin Qays was a hypocrite and time-sever. For sometime he attached himself to Imam Ali (a) pretending to be his sincere follower. The ulterior motive behind this was to amass wealth and to grasp power. Imam Ali (a) had appointed him as the Governor of Azarbaijan. He started collecting and procuring wealth by every means possible. When this was reported to Imam Ali (a), he wrote the following letter to Ash'ath: On receipt of this letter he wanted to abscond with the wealth so amassed but good counsels prevailed upon him and he was persuaded by Hujr bin Adi Kindi to got to Imam Ali (a). When his accounts were audited he had to surrender 400,000 dirhams] – the letter read as follows: “Verily, you have neither been entrusted with the governorship so that you amass wealth nor is it a tasty and juicy morsel to be swallowed up. On the contrary it is a trust committed to your care and trust. Its responsibility lies upon your shoulders. Your Amir (meaning Imam Ali himself) has appointed you as a shepherd and a guardian of the people. You have no right to do as you like and to act independently without seeking his advice and permission. In all important affairs of the State and the public, your decisions must be based on true facts and sound reasons. In your control and custody there is one of the treasuries of Allah, you are only a treasurer, you have no right to make personal use of any part of this wealth, it is your duty to pass it on to whom it belongs. I hope you will not give me a chance to prove myself a hard task-master and a harsh administrator. May you see the light.”

On page 288 of English translation of the Shia book Nahjul Balagah it is stated that: [Imam Ali had entrusted to Munzir bin Jarud Abdi something which he misappropriated. Thereupon Imam Ali wrote the following letter to him]: “The fact is that piety, honesty and righteousness of your father made me misjudge your character. I thought you were a worthy son of a worthy father and were following him in his honesty and righteousness. But all of a sudden I received about you news which confirms the fact that you do not check and control your inordinate desires, that you do not attach any importance to your life after death and you want to adorn and beautify you life at the cost of your salvation and that you are forsaking your religion to provide for your relatives. If all that is reported to me about you is correct, then the very camel you own or even the strap-shoe is superior to you. You and men of your calibre are not the persons to be confided with the financial affairs of a country or to be assigned to important vacancies of the State or to be entrusted to check and control

dishonesty and disloyalty. Therefore, as soon as you receive this letter come back to me.”

Thus Ali misjudged the above mentioned man by appointing him as governor of Shiraz, an opportunity he seized to steal Four Thousand Dirham from the treasury and then run away to the camp of Mu’awiyah as was explained by Nahjul Balagah commentators. ET

[133] ‘Abdallāh ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Sarḥ; was the milk brother of Uthman. His father was Sa’d ibn Abi Sarh. During his time as governor of Egypt (646 CE to 656 CE), Ibn Abi Sarh built a strong Egyptian Arab navy. Under his leadership the Muslim navy won a number of victories including its first major naval battle against the Byzantine emperor Constans II at the Battle of the Masts in 655 CE. One of his achievements while he is governor of Egypt was the capture of Tripoli in 647 whereby he brought Libya into the Islamic Empire (wikipedia). ET

[134] Those who said that Abu Dhar was exiled by Uthman are telling lies, for it come in the history of Ibn Khaldun (vol. 2, pg. 139), that he sought the permission of Uthman to live outside madina, Saying: “The Prophet (s.a.w) has asked me to move out of it, whenever its built up space (areas) reached Sal’a.” He permitted him and he chosed to live in Rabzah. He built a mosque in the place. Uthman gave him a herd of Camels, gave him two slaves, servants and institute a salary for him. He used to visit Madina. The distance between Rabzah and Madina is only three miles. Yaqut said: “His house is one of the best houses on the way to Madina. Abdullah bin Samit said, the mother of Abu Dhar said: “By Allah, Uthman did not exiled Abu Dhar to Rabzah, but the Prophet (s.a.w) said to him: If buidings reached Sal’a, you shall move out of it.” Hasan al-Basri said: “Allah forbids that Uthman has sent him into exile.” (refer to Muntaqa min Minhaj al-’itidal, pg. 396). ET

[135] Another false Shia innovation in call to prayer is the added slogan: “I testify that Ali is the Wali (friend) of Allah.” ET

[136] Though Shahrastani is generally regarded as a Sunni-Ash'ari theologian, he had been accused by his contemporaries, al-Khwarazmi and al-Sam'ani, of being drawn to the "people of the mountain fortresses", i.e. the Nizari Isma'ilis of Alamut (Shia Isma'iliyyah). This view is supported by modern scholars, such as Muhammad Ridā, Jalālī Nā’īnī, Muhammad Taqī, Dānish-Pazhūh, Wilferd Madelung, Jean Jolivet, Guy Monnot, and Diana Steigerwald who characterize his works as belonging to the Isma'ili tradition, while attributing his public Ash'arism and Shafi'ism to the practice of taqiyya (religious dissimulation), since Ismā'īlis were persecuted during that time. (Wikipedia). By the time the reader finished reading this segment he will realize that Shahrastani is an extreme Shia adherent and not its enemy as claimed by this Rafidi. ET

[137] Even after that incidence the Prophet (s.a.w) has given some verbal directives to his companions, as has been explained in a sound hadith: Narrated Said bin Jubair: That he heard Ibn 'Abbas saying, "Thursday! And you know not what Thursday is? After that Ibn 'Abbas wept till the stones on the ground were soaked with his tears. On that I asked Ibn 'Abbas, "What is (about) Thursday?" He said, "When the condition (i.e. health) of Allah's Apostle deteriorated, he said, 'Bring me a bone of scapula, so that I may write something for you after which you will never go astray.' The people differed in their opinions although it was improper to differ in front of a prophet, They said, 'What is wrong with him? Do you think he is delirious? Ask him (to understand). The Prophet replied, 'Leave me as I am in a better state than what you are asking me to do.' Then the Prophet ordered them to do three things saying, 'Turn out all the pagans from the Arabian Peninsula, show respect to all foreign delegates by giving them gifts as I used to do.' "The sub-narrator added, "The third order was something beneficial which either Ibn 'Abbas did not mention or he mentioned but I forgot" (Bukhari).

[138] The author means the following discussion that took place at Saqifa of Bani Ubada: "The people wept loudly, and the Ansar were assembled with Sad bin 'Ubada in the shed of Bani Saida. They said (to the emigrants). "There should be one 'Amir from us and one from you." Then Abubakar, Umar bin Al-Khattab and Abu 'baida bin Al-Jarrah went to them. 'Umar wanted to speak but Abubakar stopped him. 'Umar later on used to say, "By Allah, I intended only to say something that appealed to me and I was afraid that Abubakar would not speak so well. Then Abubakar spoke and his speech was very eloquent. He said in his statement, "We are the rulers and you (Ansars) are the ministers (i.e. advisers)," Hubab bin Al-Mundhir said, "No, by Allah we won't accept this. But there must be a ruler from us and a ruler from you." Abubakar said, "No, we will be the rulers and you will be the ministers, for they (i.e. Quarish) are the best family amongst the 'Arabs and of best origin. So you should elect either 'Umar or Abu 'Ubaida bin Al-Jarrah as your ruler." 'Umar said (to Abubakar), "No but we elect you, for you are our chief and the best amongst us and the most beloved of all of us to Allah's Apostle." So 'Umar took Abubakar's hand and gave the pledge of allegiance and the people too gave the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr. Someone said, "You have killed Sad bin Ubada" (Bukhari). ET

[139] Consider this sound hadith on the conduct of Ansar towards the appointment of Abubakar to succeed the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w): "When the Messenger of Allah (saw) passed away, the Ansar said: 'Let there be an Amir (leader) from among us and an Amir from among you.' Then Umar came

to them and said: 'Do you not know that the Messenger of Allah (saw) commanded Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer? Who among you could accept to put himself ahead of Abu Bakr?' They said: 'We seek refuge with Allah from putting ourselves ahead of Abu Bakr'" (Sunan Nisa'i). We ask Shia Rafidah: Where is conflict and disagreement in this matter? ET

[140] Abubakar and Umar stayed by the Prophet's body. In some time, however, a man by the name of Mughirah bin Shubah approached Umar and notified him of an impending emergency. Umar learned of this (i.e. the gathering of the Ansar at Saqifah) and went to the Prophet's house and sent (a message) to Abubakar, who was in the building. [Umar] sent a message to Abubakar to come to him. Abu Bakr sent back (a message) that he was occupied (i.e. with caring for the Prophet's body), but Umar sent him another message, saying: "Something (terrible) has happened that you must attend to personally." So he (Abubakar) came out to him... (The History of al-Tabari, Vol.10, p.3). ET

[141] Amongst the senior companions (r.a), Ali (r.a) also agreed to the view of Abubakar (r.a) and he was ready for this fight. On this occasion, Abubakar was very passionate, he asked for his conveyance to be brought and he set out to lead the charge but Ali took the reins of his conveyance and advised him not to go, but send others to lead this expedition. `Aisha (r.a) narrates: My father went out with his sword drawn, mounted on his steed towards Wadi al-Qissah, `Ali ibn Abi Talib came and took the reins of his mount and said: "Where are you going, O khalifah (successor) of the messenger of Allah? I say to you what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said to you on the day of Uhud: "You will not stop, and you will not leave us in loss with regards to yourself, by Allah, if something has to afflict us regarding you, there will be no administrative support for Islam ever." So he returned and let the army carry on" (Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah vol. 6 p. 315). In short, Sayyiduna `Ali (r.a) agreed with the rest of the senior companions that war should be waged against those that refuse to pay Zakah, so the step taken by Abubakar was correct. ET

[142] Al-Mada`ini said: When Abubakar's pain became unbearable, he sent after `Ali, `Uthman and other men from the Muhajirin and Ansar then said: "Verily, as you can see I am afflicted with an intense illness, and I sense that, due to its severity I will soon die. Alas, there must be a man in charge to run your affairs. It seems that God Has released you from your pledges, and my covenant with you has reached its end as well. God returned the decision to you, so appoint over yourselves whomsoever you wish. Indeed, if you choose a leader while I am alive, it's less likely that you'll differ among yourselves after I die." The Muslims then went and attempted to select a man but things didn't work out for them and soon they returned to Abubakar saying: "O successor of

God's Messenger (saw), our opinion is your opinion." He replied: "What if you differ?" They reassured him, so he said: "Give me an oath to God that you will be accepting." So they did, and he told them: "Then give me some time, so that I can see what is best in God's view and what is best for God's religion and slaves." (Askari, Ibn Shubah, Tabari). ET

Abubakar thereafter summoned Abdurrahman bin Auf, and asked for his opinion about the nomination of Umar as the Caliph, Abdurrahman favored the nomination. Some other companions were also consulted. The general consensus was that Umar was the fittest person to be appointed as the Caliph. Usaid bin Hudair said, "After you, O Caliph, Umar is the most deserving person for the office of the Caliph. There is none more resolute than he among us. His inner self is better than his exterior." Usman favored the nomination and remarked, "What is hidden of Umar is better than what outwardly appears; there is not his equal amongst us." Sa'id bin Zaid supported the proposal emphatically.

The general consensus was that Umar was the fittest person to be nominated as the Caliph. There was, however, an under current of feeling that Umar had the fiery and irascible temper, and he might not be able to show moderation so necessary for the head of the community. Abubakar observed that Umar's display of severity was meant to counteract his (Abubakar's) leniency. Abubakar felt that when the full responsibility of government was devolved upon Umar, he would become moderate in his opinion. Abubakar said: "I can say from my personal experience that Umar has always cooled me down whenever I have lost my temper with any one, just as whenever he felt me to be too lenient he counseled greater severity. For this reason I feel certain that with time, Umar will achieve the moderation that you desire."

Among all the companions it is only Talha who objected to the nomination of Umar. He said: "O successor of the Prophet, you knew full well how harsh Umar has been towards us all during your regime, and Allah only knows what he will meet to us when you are gone. You know that you are leaving us forever, and yet you are content to leave us in the hands of a man whose fierce and ungovernable rages are well known to you. Think O Chief, what answer will you give to Your Lord for such a behest?"

At this objection of Talha, Abubakar who was lying prostrate on his bed rose up with considerable effort and addressing Talha said: "Have you come to frighten me? I swear that when I meet my Lord, I will gladly tell Him that I appointed as ruler over His people, the man who was the best of them all." (www.theislamicworld.net). ET

[143] Ibn Kathir in his book of history stated: “People spent a good night while the killers of 'Uthman spent a bad night (due to the agreement reached by Ali, Talha and Zubair on fishing out his murderers and punishing them according to the Islamic law): “They spent the night consulting each other. Then, they agreed to start the war at dawn and woke up before dawn. They were about 2000 in number. Each group of them attacked the people closest to them. Then the two parties started to fight in order to protect their own soldiers. Thus, the people woke up and took up their weapons. They said, 'The people of Koofah invaded us at night. They attacked us at night, deceiving us.' They thought that this was from a group of 'Ali's army. Then 'Ali was told about what happened he said, 'What happened to the people?' They said, 'The people of Basrah have attacked us at night'. Then each party got prepared for the battle. So, the fighting started and no party was aware of the plan of the Khawaarij. There were 20,000 men with 'Ali and 30,000 with 'Ash'ath both. The companions of Ibn Sawda did not stop killing, although the caller of 'Ali kept repeating: 'O people, stop this! Stop this!' But nobody listened.” ET

[144] In the Shia book 'Nahjul Balagah,' they reported that Imam Ali said to Uthman, while he is under siege: “... I swear to you by Allah that you should not be that Imam of this community people who will be killed because it has been said that, 'An Imam of this community will be killed after which killing and fighting will be made open for them till the Day of Judgement, and he will confuse their matters and spread troubles over them. As a result, they will not discern truth from wrong. They will oscillate like waves and would be utterly misled’” (Nahjul Balagah, Semon, No. 163, pg. 165). ET

[145] This is the alliance of those who killed Umar: “Harmuzan (the Persian army commander and a governor of one of their regions) “converted” to Islam and moved to Medinah, whereupon he planned the Persian revenge on the Arab Muslims. Harmuzan blamed the Commander of the Faithful Umar for the downfall of the Persian Empire, and it was thus that Harmuzan hatched the plan to assassinate the Caliph.

In Medinah, Harmuzan became close companions with a staunch Christian named Jafeena Al-Khalil. Jafeena was a political pawn of the Roman ruler and had served as an official in Damascus, Palestine and Heerah; the defeat of Rome by the Muslims left its mark on Jafeena who—like Harmuzan—swore revenge. The third partner was a Jew by the name of Saba bin Shamoon (whose son would be Abdullah Ibn Saba, the notorious founder of the Shia movement). Saba despised the Muslims who had expelled the Jews on charges of conspiracy. All three of these individuals – Harmuzan the Zoroastrian, Jafeena the Christian, and Saba the Jew – belonged to peoples who had grievances against the rise of Muslim dominance.

They hired Feroz Abu Lulu, a Persian, who had recently been captured by the Muslims as a POW; he was a slave under a Muslim master. Abu Lulu stabbed Umar bin Khattab to death. A day before Umar had been assassinated, Abdur Rehman—Abu Bakr's son—had seen Abu Lulu standing with Harmuzan and Jafeena. The three men were whispering to one another. As Abdur Rehman passed by, the three got startled and a double edged dagger fell to the ground. Abdur Rehman would later confirm that this was the same dagger that killed Umar. The murder of Umar was thus instigated by a coalition of a Roman Christian, a Jew, and a Persian Zoroastrian. It should be noted that the Prophet had prophesized that the Christians, Jews, and pagans would always be united against the Muslims.

Today, the modern day Shia venerate Abu Lulu, and they call him “Baba Shuja-e-din” which can be translated as “Honored Defender of Religion.” These Shia have a shrine erected for this murderer, located in the Iranian city of Kashan called the Abu Lulu Mausoleum wherein he is buried. The Shia travels from far distances to pray inside this shrine, and many of the Shia fast on the day that Umar was killed, and even pass out sweets. Feroz Abu Lulu is one of the venerated founding figures of Shia ideology; the same people who conspired to kill Umar were the ones who planted the seeds of the Shia movement. http://www.chiite.fr/en/history_03.html ET

[146] These are some of the crimes of Shia Rafidah against Islam and Muslims when they become established in Persia: “They followed the following methods to convert people to Shiism: Imposing Shiism as the state and mandatory religion for the whole nation and much forcible conversions of Iranian Sufi Sunnis to Shiism [Modern Iran: roots and results of revolution. Nikki R Keddie, Yann Richard, pp. 13, 20. The Encyclopedia of world history: ancient, medieval, and modern. Peter N. Stearns, William Leonard Langer, p. 360. Immortal: A Military History of Iran and Its Armed Forces. Steven R Ward, pg.43]

He destroyed Sunni mosques. This was even noted by Tomé Pires, the Portuguese ambassador to China who visited Iran in 1511–12, who when referring to Ismail noted: “He (i.e. Ismail Safawi) reforms our churches, destroys the houses of all Moors who follow (the Sunnah of) Muhammad...” (This is a tradition still practiced by the Shia-Rafidi-Safavid Mullahs of Iran, like under the reign of the AZERI-TURK Khamenei who himself ordered the destruction of the Sheikh Feiz Sunni Mosque of Mashad).

He (Ismail I) enforced the ritual and compulsory cursing of the first three Sunni Caliphs (Abu Bakr, Omar, and Othman) as usurpers, from all mosques, disbanded Sunni Tariqahs and seized their assets, used state patronage to develop Shia shrines, institutions and religious art and imported Shia scholars

to replace Sunni scholars. [Sources: A new introduction to Islam. Daniel W Brown, p. 191. Encyclopaedic Historiography of the Muslim World. NK Singh, A Samiuddin, p. 90. The Cambridge illustrated history of the Islamic world. Francis Robinson, p. 72.]

He shed Sunni blood and destroyed and desecrated the graves and mosques of Sunnis. This caused the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II (who initially congratulated Ismail on his victories) to advise and ask the young monarch (in a “fatherly” manner) to stop the anti-Sunni actions. However, Ismail was strongly anti-Sunni, ignored the Sultans warning and continued to spread the Shia faith by the sword. [Sources: Immortal: A Military History of Iran and Its Armed Forces. Steven R. Ward, p. 44. Iran and America: re-kindling a love lost]. Badi Badiozamani, pp. 174–5.]

He persecuted, imprisoned and executed stubbornly resistant Sunnis. [Sources: The Cambridge illustrated history of the Islamic world. Francis Robinson, p. 72. Iraq: Old Land, New Nation in Conflict. William Spencer, p. 51.]

With the establishment of Safavid rule, there was a very raucous and colourful, almost carnival-like holiday on 26 Dhu al-Hijjah (or alternatively, 9 Rabi’ al-awwal) celebrating the murder of Caliph Omar. The highlight of the day was making an effigy of Omar to be cursed, insulted, and finally burned. However, as relations between Iran and Sunni countries improved, the holiday was no longer observed (at least officially ...). [Source: Culture and customs of Iran. Elton L Daniel, ‘Alī Akbar Mahdī, p. 185]

In 1501 Ismail invited all the Shia living outside Iran to come to Iran and be assured of protection from the Sunni majority. [Source: Iraq: Old Land, New Nation in Conflict. William Spencer, p. 51.]

The early Safavid rulers took a number of steps against the Sunni Ulema of Iran. These steps included giving the Ulema the choice of conversion, death, or exile [Sources: A new introduction to Islam, By Daniel W. Brown, pg.191^ The Middle East and Islamic world reader, By Marvin E. Gettleman, Stuart Schaar, pg.42^ Immortal: A Military History of Iran and Its Armed Forces, By Steven R. Ward, pg.43]

and massacring the Sunni clerics who resisted the Shia transformation of Iran, as witnessed in Herat.[32] As a result, many Sunni scholars who refused to adopt the new religious direction lost their lives or fled to the neighboring Sunni states. [Sources: The failure of political Islam, By Olivier Roy, Carol Volk, pg.170^ Conceptualizing/re-conceptualizing Africa: the construction of African ..., By Maghan Keita, pg.90^ Iran: a short history : from Islamization to the present, By Monika Gronke, pg.90]. www.sonsofsunnah.com.

Other examples of Safavid crimes and massacre of Sunni Persian Scholars and influential figures: It was, however, nothing less than a reign of terror that inaugurated the new dispensation. On capturing Tabriz in 907/1501, a city two-thirds Sunnite in population, Shah Esmā'il threatened with death all who might resist the adoption of Shi'ite prayer ritual in the main congregational mosque, and he had Qezelbāš soldiers patrol the congregation to ensure that none raise his voice against the cursing of the first three caliphs, viewed as enemies of the Prophet's family.

In Tabriz and elsewhere, gangs of professional executors known as the *tabarrā'iān* would accost the townsfolk at random, forcing them to curse the objectionable personages on pain of death. Selective killings of prominent Sunnites occurred in a large number of places, notably Qazvin and Isfahan, and in Shiraz and Yazd, outright massacres took place. Sunnite mosques were desecrated, and the tombs of eminent Sunnite scholars destroyed (Aubin, 1970, pp. 237-38; idem, 1988, pp. 94-101).

http://www.cultureofiran.com/islam_safavid_era.html

Twelver Shia crimes in Isfahan: Then they (safavids) moved towards Isfahan and laid siege to it. After short period they captured Isfahan. Isfahan was one of the largest cities of Iran and all its people were Sunni Shafis. Isfahan had been the capital city many times before and lately it was the capital of Sultan Yaqob Bayendar... Isfahan during its Islamic history produced many great scholars to the world that till today they are the pride of the Islamic world. The Qizilbash (Safavid soldiers) committed such atrocities [in Isfahan] that their crimes in Azerbaejan became small compared to it. Every mosque, Madrasah and historical building that was built in Isfahan from the times of Tahirid, Daylimate, Seljuks and Timurids were damaged by them.

The majority of scholars and fuqaha and students and the people of knowledge who could not flee the city were killed. The killing the people of Isfahan continued for several consecutive days and great number of the people of Isfahan were massacred. During this time the properties of the people were looted and farms and orchards were burned. [Source: Qizilbahsan in the History of Iran – The role of Safavid Qizilbash in the History of Iran – Amir Hossein Khonjee page 104.].

Twelve Shia crimes in Heart: Shah Ismail entered Herat in 889k (Ramadan 916 h) and ordered the killing, destruction and plunder in the city. Allama Taftazani who was over 70 years old and was one of the greatest scholar of Islamic world in his time and religious authority of Iran, Transoxania, Turkestan, India and Ottoman sultanates. Rulers of India, Turkestan and Ottoman would address him in their letters as 'Mowlana al-Azam', the great Mowlana. At this time the Allama was the prisoner of Qoli Jaan.

Personality of such type was cut into pieces by the Qizilbashan (safavid soldiers) on the orders of Shah Ismail for the reason of being a 'fanatic Sunni' and so that the 'People of Misguidance' are removed from the world and the 'Mazhab of Truth of Qizlibash' becomes universal. They have written that while Allamah Taftazani was fasting Shah Ismail ordered him to do Tabarah and leave his 'False Mazhab'. Since Allamah did not obey the order, Shah Ismail ordered that he be cut into pieces. Then parts of his body was burned and thrown in the streets. [Source: Qizilbahsan in the History of Iran – The role of Safavid Qizilbash in the History of Iran – Amir Hossein Khonjee page 137-138.] www.youpunchuredthearc.wordpress.com. ET

[147] Ahlus-Sunnah believed that there is nothing compulsory upon Allah or compulsory for Him except what He made compulsory upon Himself or for Himself. So we can only know what He made compulsory upon Himself or for Himself through texts (Qur'an and Sound Sunnah), i.e. Allah says: "Say (O Muhammad): "To whom belongs all that is in the heavens and the earth?" Say: "To Allah. He has prescribed Mercy for Himself..." (6:12). In a hadith al-Qudsi Allah says: "O My servants! I have forbidden dhulm (oppression or injustice) for Myself, and I have made it forbidden amongst you, so do not oppress one another... (Muslim). ET

[148] What is meant by the principle of Lutf (Allah's Grace) by Shia and Mu'atazilite dialectical theologians is: whatever brings man close to obedience and take him away from committing sin. They stated that; since Allah is just in His Wisdom and Merciful to His servants and His protecting them. He does not accept from His servants' unbelief and He doesn't desire injustice to anyone. He would not hide from them anything, which if He bestowed it to them will make them to be good and obedient. Thus Allah sent Prophets as grace from Him for without sending them they cannot believe. Allah also didn't hide from His servants all the graces that will take them away from the path of perdition. Shia and Mu'atazilites believed that this grace is "compulsory upon Allah," due to His justice and wisdom. Their opponents such as the Ash'ariyyah and the Matrudiyyah considered this statement as disrespectful to Allah. Matrudiyyah preferred the phrase "compulsory for Allah." ET

[149] According to Shia hadith the main reason why their infallible Imam is lost and never found or hid himself and abandoned his responsibilities is because he feared to be killed by the oppressors from who he is supposed to save the people. If their savior has run away out of fear, who will be saved among them? Their hadith stated: Muhammad ibn Yahya has narrated from Ja'far ibn Muhammad from al-Hassan ibn Mu'awiya from 'Abdallah ibn Jabala from

‘Abdallah ibn Bukayr from Zurara who has said the following: “I heard (Imam) Abu ‘Abdullah say, ‘The person who will rise to Divine power on earth will disappear from the public sight before he will do so.’ I then asked, ‘Why will this happen so?’ He said, ‘He will be afraid.’ He then pointed to his midsection meaning he (Mehdi) might be murdered.” (www.al-shia.com/html/ara/books/al-kafi-1/144.html).

Shia shaikh and known writer, Baqir Sharif Qurashi in his book “Life of Imam al-Mahdi”, (Publisher: Ansariyan Publications – Qum First Edition 1427 -2006 – 1385) at the page 241-242 wrote: “In the tradition of Zurarah this same cause is mentioned by the Imam that: ‘For the Qaim (Mahdi), there is an occultation before his reappearance.’ Zurarah immediately asked, ‘What for?’ Imam replied, ‘For fear of being murdered.’

Shayih Tusi says: “The cause of the obstacle in the reappearance of Imam Mahdi nothing but the fear of being killed. This is because if there had been any other reason, his remaining in occultation would not have been justified” (Ghaibah, Shaikh Tusi pg. 199). ET

[150] Sophism is a specious argument for displaying ingenuity in reasoning or for deceiving someone or any false argument or fallacy or an argument apparently correct in form but actually invalid; especially : such an argument used to deceive. ET

[151] In Najul Balagh, the Shia book of hadith they recorded that Ali said: “I have been informed that Busr (an army commander of Mu’awiyah) has overpowered Yemen. By Allah, I have begun thinking about these people that they would shortly snatch away the whole country through their unity on their wrong and your disunity (from your own right), and separation, your disobedience of your Imam in matters of right and their obedience to their leader in matters of wrong, their fulfillment of the trust in favor of their master and your betrayal, their good work in their cities and your mischief. Even if I give you charge of a wooden bowl I fear you would run away with its handle. O’ my Allah they are disgusted of me and I am disgusted of them. They are weary of me and I am weary of them. Change them for me with better ones and change me for them with worse one” (Sermon, number 25).

According to Shia narrations this is how Ali censured his men and praises the men of Mu’awiyah. This showed to you that whatever Ibn Taimiyyah stated about Rafidah is true and correct. ET

O’ my Allah melt their hearts as salt melts in water. ET

[152] A Shia scholar Sayyid Muhammad rizvi in his book, Introduction to the Islamic Shari’ah (pg. 35) stated: “In Shi’ah jurisprudence, *ijmâ’* is not by itself a source of the shari’ah; instead, it is a means of proving the existence of an oral proof which is now extinct.” And Ayatullah Murtadha Muttahari wrote: “Second,

in the Shi'ite view, consensus is not genuinely binding in its own right, rather it is binding in as much as it is a means of discovering the Sunnah" (jurisprudence and its principles, pg. 8). Thus, according to Shia consensus is not a source of Islamic law until if it supported by a hadith of the infallibles. And since it is not a proof to them why are they advancing arguments and supporting them with it? ET

[153] From Shia sources Ali has said that he is not infallible. Imam Abu Abdullah said: **"The Prophet (s.a.w) use to salute the women and they would reply him. Imam Ali use to salute the women, but he dislike saluting the young (women) saying; I fear that her voice will impress me resulting in my receiving more than what I want in the form of reward"** (Kafi, vol.2, pg.648 – Chapter on saluting women). Didn't this showed that Ali is no infallible? In Nahjul balagah, sermon no. 216, Ali (R.A) said: **"...As I am not above making mistakes in my actions."** In Bihar al – Anwar, vol. 40, pg. 199, Ali said: **"My Lord, how can I invoke You after I have disobeyed You."** In Raudat al –Kafi, pg. 293 Ali said: **"Don't stop telling me the truth or giving me a just advice, for I am not in myself above making mistakes and I have no guarantee on that with regard to my conduct."** In the book Amali by Tusi, pgs. 518 and 566, Ali said: **"If I tell the truth confirm me and if I speak wrongly correct me for I am a man like you."** In Bihar al – Anwar, vol. 25, pg. 207, Jaafar as – Sadiq said; **"Surely we commit sins, do wrong and then repent to Allah."** According to a narration in Nahjul balagah, Imam Ali appointed Ash'ath bin Qais as the governor of Azarbaijan, and the man misappropriated public fund to the extent that Ali wrote to him, warning him. Does this indicated to a person who has knowledge of the unseen? Or can we ascribe – Allah forbid – negligence to Imam Ali (R.A)? ET

[154] The Prophet Muhammad prophesized Jerusalem would be conquered after his death.[Bukhari] The prophecy was fulfilled when, according to Encyclopedia Britannica: "In 638 the Muslim Caliph, Umar I, entered Jerusalem."

The Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) prophesized the conquest of Persia [Muslim]. It was conquered by Umar's commander, Sa'ad ibn Abi Waqqas. In the words of Encyclopedia Britannica: "...raids into Sasanian territory were quickly taken up by Muhammad's Caliphs, or deputies, at Medina - Abubakar and Umar ibn al-Khattab... an Arab victory at Al-Qadisiyyah in 636/637 was followed by the sack of the Sasanian winter capital at Ctesiphon on the Tigris. The Battle of Nahavand in 642 completed the Sasanids' vanquishment."

The Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) prophesized the conquest of Egypt [Muslim]. In the words of Encyclopedia Britannica: "Amr... undertook the invasion in 639 with a small army of some 4,000 men (later reinforced). With what seems astonishing speed the Byzantine forces were routed and had withdrawn from Egypt by 642... Various explanations have been given for the speed with which the conquest was achieved." [Encyclopedia Britannica].

The Prophet (s.a.w) foretold confrontation with the Turks [Bukhari, Muslim]. The first conflict took place in the caliphate of Umar in 22 AH [Ibn Kathir, Al-Bidayah wan-Nihayah].

The Prophet (s.a.w) foretold the first maritime battle to be undertaken by Muslims would be witnessed by Umm Haram, the first woman to participate in a naval expedition. He also prophesied the first assault on Constantinople [Bukhari, Muslim].

The first maritime battle in Muslim history was in 28 AH in the rule of Mu'awiyah. It was witnessed by Umm Haram as foretold by Prophet Muhammad, and Yazid ibn Mu'awiyah led the first attack on Constantinople in 52 AH.[Ibn Kathir, Al-Bidayah wan-Nihayah]

The prophecy that Rome, Persia, and Yemen will be conquered was made during the Battle of Confederates in 626 CE, [Bukhari] under extreme circumstances, as is described by the Quran: **"[Remember] when they came at you from above you and from below you, and when eyes shifted [in fear], and hearts reached the throats and you assumed about God [various] assumptions. There, the believers were tested and shaken with a severe shaking. And [remember] when the hypocrites and those in whose hearts is disease said, 'God and His Messenger did not promise us except delusion.'"** (Quran 33:10-12)

[155] The Prophet (s.a.w) has repeatedly declared, "You should, after my death, follow the way of Abubakar and 'Umar" (Hakim, Tirmidhi, Ibn Hanbal and Ibn Maja). The Prophet, upon him be peace and blessings, meant that Abubakar and 'Umar would succeed him as Caliphs. He also predicted that Abubakar's reign would be short, whereas 'Umar would remain longer to be able to make many conquests.

[156] The period of Khilafah (Caliphate) was thirty years as it is reported in some narrations. The Prophet, said: "The period of caliphate in my nation will be 30 years, then it will be a kingdom." Safinah who was a slave of the Prophet, and who narrated the above narration, said, "We counted the

caliphate of Abubakar, then he said, the caliphate of 'Umar and 'Uthman, then he said, and the caliphate of 'Ali, and we found that it was thirty years." [Ahmad] After these 30 years, Al-Hasan ibn 'Ali took over from his father 'Ali for a period of six months and few days, as Jalalud-Deen As-Suyuti stated. So the caliphate of Abubakar was from 11 A.H. to 13 A.H., the caliphate of 'Umar was from 13 A.H. to 23 A.H., then the caliphate of 'Uthman was from 23 A.H. to 35 A.H., and from 35 A.H. to 40 A.H. was the caliphate of 'Ali .

Al-Hasan abdicated from the caliphate in 41 A.H. So the thirty years of caliphate were completed with the caliphate of Al-Hasan after the death of the Prophet. After this, the era of kingdom started. The authors who were relied upon in this subject are Ad-Dhahabi (At-Tarikh Al-Kabir), Ibn Kathir (Al-Bidayah Wan-Nihayah), and As-Suyuti (Tarikh Al-Khulafa') all.

In another hadith the Prophet (s.a.w) said: "Prophethood (meaning Muhammad (SAW) himself) will remain with you for as long as Allah wills it to remain, then Allah will raise it up whenever he wills to raise it up. Afterwards, there will be a Caliphate that follows the guidance of Prophethood remaining with you for as long as Allah wills it to remain. Then, He will raise it up whenever He wills to raise it up. Afterwards, there will be a reign of violently oppressive [The reign of Muslim kings who are partially unjust] rule and it will remain with you for as long as Allah wills it to remain. Then, there will be a reign of tyrannical rule and it will remain for as long as Allah wills it to remain. Then, Allah will raise it up whenever He wills to raise it up. Then, there will be a Caliphate that follows the guidance of Prophethood"(Musnad Ahmed).

A Caliphate that rules according to the guidance revealed to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). This period is called the reign of the rightly guided Caliphs, starting with Abubakar, then Umar, then Uthman and ending with the murder of Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with them all. Some scholars included the short reign of Al-Hasan bin Ali, the grandson of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w). These are the thirty years which the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) stated comprised the reign of the rightly guided Caliphs.

While in Makka under great tortures, the Prophet predicted the future victories of Islam. Bukhari and Abu Dawud quote Habbab ibn Arat, who said: "Once, during the days of trouble and torture in Makka, I went to God's Messenger, who was sitting in the shade of the Ka'ba. I was still a slave in the hands of the Makkans then. They inflicted on me severe tortures. Unable to endure those tortures any more, I requested God's Messenger to pray to God for help and salvation. But he turned towards me and said:

By God, previous communities had to endure more pitiless tortures. Some of them were made to lie in ditches and cut in two with saws but this did not make them forsake their faith. They were skinned alive but they never became weak against the enemy. Surely God will perfect this religion, but you display

undue haste. A day will come when a woman will travel alone by herself from San'a to Hadramawt fearing nothing but wild beasts. However, you show impatience." All these predictions come to pass during the Caliphates of Abubakar, Umar, Uthman and Ali. ET

[157] Ahmad narrated in his Musnad (27224) from Abu Basrah al-Ghifaari, the companion of the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) that the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) said: "I asked my Lord, may He be glorified and exalted, for four things, and He granted me three of them and withheld one from me. I asked Allah, may He be glorified and exalted, not to cause my ummah to agree on misguidance, and He granted me that."

Among the wisdoms of consensus are: "Hence it is known that Allah, may He be exalted, has protected the ummah of Muhammad (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) from agreeing on misguidance or error. There is a subtle reason for this that was explained by az-Zarkashi when he said: The reason why only this ummah was given this quality of only agreeing on what is correct is that they are now the only believing group on earth, because the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) was sent to all mankind, whereas the Prophets who came before him were sent only to their own peoples, so the followers of each one were only part of the total number of believers. Therefore each community was not the only one that was the believing group in any particular era. But in the case of this ummah, the believers are all in this ummah (and not anywhere else), and the hand of Allah is with the jamaa'ah (main body of Muslims). Hence – and Allah knows best – they were given the privilege of agreeing only on that which is sound and correct" (Bahr al-Muheet, 6/396). ET

[158] In the Arabic language the word 'Wali' has many meanings among which are: supporter, benefactor, sponsor, close associate, friend, relative, patron, protector, legal guardian, curator, tutor, holy man, saint, a man close to Allah, slave. (Hans Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Arabic Language). ET

[159] One who does things blindly, at random or heedlessly; it said concerning the person who does not realize or think about what he is doing. ET

[160] Ibn Athir stated that the word "mawla" has many meanings in Arabic language, some of which are: "Lord, owner, benefactor, helper, lover, client, slave, emancipator of a slave, neighbor, paternal cousin, servant, and in law etc. The word "mawla" never come with the meaning of the word "awla" (more deserving) in Arabic language (refer to Arabic dictionaries). The Prophet's companions (R.A) and members of the Prophet's family (R.A) never understand that this hadith entail appointment of Ali (R.A) as leader of the Muslim community after the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W). Ali (R.A) never

advance this hadith as a proof that he is more deserving to be the leader nor was it advanced by any member of his family, children and progeny. When people asked him about appointing Hasan (R.A) after him he replied: "I will not command you (to do that) nor prevent you, you are more knowledgeable of your affairs."

Therefore, the hadith of Ghadir Khum is neither a "Dhanni" (speculative or indecisive), nor a "Qat'i" (decisive, clear, definitive) proof. "Dhanni" is an evidence or proof that can accept more than one interpretation while "Qat'i" is a solid and clear proof which induces certainty on the person who sees it (and this is the only proof that can be accepted in fundamentals of religion). ET

[161] If a scholar was described as "Hafiz", then he is one who memorizes and understands a great amount of Hadith and excels in their sciences and has deep knowledge on the conditions of the narrators and the various chains of the reports. ET

[162]

Al-Mawdu: These are books in which fabricated or concocted narrations are compiled. Such books include; i) Al Mawduaat al Kubra by Ibn Jawzi, ii) Al Minar al Munif fi al Sahih wa al Da'if by Ibn Qayyam, iii) Al Mawduaat al Kubra by Mulla Ali Qari, iv) Silsila al Ahadith al Da'ifa by Allama Nasiruddin Albaani. So Muslims scholars have written books (and recorded in their books) on weak and fabricated hadiths, so that they are known and avoided and not so that they are acted upon. ET

[163] Masanid is plural of Musnad hadith collection, which is a book of hadith that has been arranged according to the name of the companion narrating each hadith. For example, a musnad might begin by listing a number of the hadith, complete with their respective sanads, of Abu Bakr, and then listing a number of hadith from Umar, and then Uthman ibn Affan and so on. Individual compilers of this type of collection may vary in their method of arranging those Companions whose hadith they were collecting. An example of this type of book is the Musnad of Ahmad.

[164] Sihah is the plural of Sahih (sound) Al-Sahih: These are the books that contains ahadith, which on their personal judgment and criterion of the compilers, as 'sahih'. However, there exist probabilities that some of the ahadith in such books may not have been judged 'sahih' by other compilers. Few of such books are; i) Sahih al-Bukhari, ii) Sahih Muslim, iii) Sahih ibn Khuzaima, iv) Sahih ibn Habbab, v) Kitab al ilzamat by Abul Hasan Ali ibn Umar Dar Qutni, and others. www.studying-islam.org ET

[165] Jawam'ie is plural of Jami (general or comprehensive books of hadith). These are the books in which ahadith cover the following eight subjects viz., 1) Siyar, plural of Sirah – the complete biography of Prophet Muhammad sws, 2) Adab, plural of 'adab' – the etiquettes, 3) Tafsir – the exegesis of Qur'an, 4) Aqa'ed – the believes, 5) Fitn, plural of 'fitna' – sedition, discord, 6) Ishraat – the signs of day of judgment, 7) Ahkam, plural of 'hukm' – laws of 'shareeah', and 8) Manaqib, plural of Manqabt – the fine qualities of the Prophet sws, his 'sahaaba' (companions) and his tribe. The following books of ahadith fall in this category; i) Jama'e al Bukhari, ii) Jama'e Muslim, iii) Jama'e al Tirmidhi, iv) Jama'e Sufyan ibn Saeed ibn Masrooq al Kufi, and others. The books Jama'e al Bukhari and Jama'e Muslim are also termed as al Sahih. www.studying-islam.org ET

[166] It is well know that stars are much larger than the earth, many stars are hundreds of times larger, hotter and brighter than the sun, how is it possible for a star to descend on a little house? Perhaps those who relate this hadith were among the laity who believed that the stars are of the same size as seen by the naked eye from the earth. Refer to science books or more knowledge about the stars. ET

[167] Ali (r.a) did not have a house in Makka and as such he transferred from the house of Abu Talib to the house of the Prophet (s.a.w) and stayed in the same house with him before and after the start if the Prophetic mission. Consequently, Ali (r.a) did not have a house in Makka for a star to descend upon. ET

[168] According to the Qur'an the word "Rijs" (which is translated here as uncleanness) means; evil deeds and sins (33:33), worshiping idols (22:30), Allah's anger (10:100) , suspicion (9:125), become impure due to evil deeds (9:95), Allah's punishment (7:71), impure things or food (6:145), and abomination (5:90). Imam Sadiq said the meaning of the word, "**Rijs is doubt**" (al – Burhan, vol. 3, pg. 123). Imam Baqir said: "**Rijs is doubt and by Allah we have no doubt concerning our Lord.**" In another statement he said: "**... in the true Allah and His religion forever**" (refer to Tafsir al – Ayyashi, vol. 1, pg. 277, Amali by Tusi, pg.573 and Kafi, vol. 1, pg.288). Thus, according to the Imams Rijs never means infallibility from committing mistakes. If removal of Rijs entailed infallibility from sins and mistakes, then all the Prophet's companions who participated in the battle of Badr are also infallibles because Allah said with regard to them: "**(Remember) when He (Allah) covered you with a slumber as a security from Him, and He caused water (rain) to descend on you from the sky, to clean you thereby and to**

remove from you the Rijz (whispering, evil suggestions) of Satan, and to strengthen your hearts, and make your feet firm thereby” (8:11) ET.

[169] A former Shia scholar, Ayatullah Borqei stated (In his book ‘Naqd al-Muraja’at): “The Sayyid and others like him (among Shia Rafidah) have confused the phrase “for my kinship with you (Fil qurba)” with the phrase “in my kinship (Fi zil qurba)” and they claimed that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) is asking the polytheists of Makka to love his descendants as a reward for his message Since they have denied his message (they did not accept it), how can he demand from them a reward for the message (which they have rejected)? Nay (what the verse means), the Prophet (s.a.w) was commanded to tell the polytheists; between me and you there are kinship relation and rights of good neighborliness, thus, loving kindness shall prevail among us and not enmity and hatred. This is the interpretation that appeared in all books on exegeses of the Qur’an, and even (the Shia Imamiyyah scholar) Tibrisi in his book on exegeses of the Qur’an titled, Majma’ul Bayan (vol.9, pg.48), gave to the verse an additional meaning: “That you love me seeking the grace of Allah and for the sake of Allah.” ET

[170] Consider these statements from a Shia book titled “I am That (ANA HOWA).” In this book they are describing Ali bin Abi Talib. The book can be downloaded from the Shia website www.wilayatmission.com :

1. I am howa (that). (Israr al Sharia)
 2. I am the “I am” and I am the “I am”. I am the essence of every essence and the essence of every essence is also Me. (Mashariqul Anwar al Yaqeen)
 3. I am zahir (apparent). I am batin (hidden). (Jamia al Israr)
 4. I am the first and I am the last. (Jamia al Israr)
 5. I am the source of all noors (lights). (Jamia al Israr, Israr al Sharia)
 6. I am the one who gives life and I am the one who orders death. (Al Zam al Nasib).
 60. I am the zikr (remembrance) of Allah. (Tafseer Noor al Saqlain)
 64. I am the one who will punish the people of hell. No one can say this except Me. If another claims this, then he is a liar. (Tafseer Noor al Saqlain)
 66. I am the distributor of jannah (Paradise) and jahunnum (Hell). (Fazail ibne Shazaan)
 67. I am the Lord of the Kauthar. (Fazail ibne Shazaan).
- If you read that book you will find more pagan beliefs of the Shia Rafidah. The above numbering is as in the book. ET

[171] It come in Bukhari that: “... The nephew of Suraqa bin Ju'sham said that his father informed him that he heard Suraqa bin Ju'sham saying, "The

messengers of the heathens of Quraish came to us declaring that they had assigned for the persons who would kill or arrest Allah's Apostle and Abubakar, a reward equal to their blood money..." (Bukhari) ET.

[172] It is narrated that: , Abubakar (radiallahu 'anhu) sometimes went ahead of the Prophet (s.a.w) and then behind him, until the prophet noticed his restlessness and asked, Abubakar (r.a), what's the matter? Often you come behind me and sometimes you go ahead!" Abubakar (r.a) replied, "O Prophet (s.a.w) of God, when I think of those pursuing you, I come behind you but then I apprehend an ambush so that I go in front of you." ET

[173] Talha ibn Ubaidullah was one of the Companions, one of the first people to have the honor of becoming Muslims, after Abubakar and Uthman, as followers of our Prophet (s.a.w), who was tortured as a result and demonstrated great heroism in defending the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) at the Battle of Uhud. Talha ibn Ubaidullah caught the arrows fired at our Prophet (s.a.w) by a sharpshooter called Malik ibn Zubayr in order to protect him; his fingers were cut to shreds and he was left one-handed. He received some eighty injuries in this battle, suffering spear, sword and arrow wounds all over his body, though he never left the Messenger of Allah's (s.a.w) side, but always sought to defend him. When he gained consciousness, the first concern of Talha ibn Ubaidullah, who fainted from loss of blood when Abubakar and Sa'ad Ibn Abi Waqqas reached the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) was about the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) rather than himself. ET

[174] Suhaib spent over 10 years in Makkah enduring torture and hardships. When the Prophet (peace be upon him) decided to migrate to Madinah with Abubakar, Suhaib wished to join them but the pagans of Makka put him under house arrest.

After departure of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w), Suhaib managed to leave at night leaving all his wealth buried in the house. He rushed toward Madina on his mount with a sword and bow in hand. The guards later realized and rushed behind him. They got him on the way. Suhaib climbed a hillock and addressed the guards, "You know I am one of the best archers. If you come near me, By God, I shall kill one of you. Then I shall fight with my sword." The guards' leader said, "By God, we shall not let you escape with your life and your wealth..."

Suhaib got a clue, he wanted the company of the Prophet (s.a.w) at every cost. He said, "Would you get out of my way if I give you my wealth?" "Yes," they replied. Suhaib told them the place in his house where he had buried the wealth and they allowed him to go.

He rushed toward Madina and reached Quba. When the Holy Prophet (s.a.w) saw him, he was overjoyed and greeted Suhaib saying, O Abu Yahya. "Best

deal, most profitable deal” he repeated it three times. Suhaib’s face beamed with happiness. “By God, no one has come before me to you, it is only Jibril, from Almighty Allah, who could have told you about this.”

A verse in the Holy Qur’an indicated toward this incident. “And of mankind, is he who would sell himself, seeking the pleasure of Allah. And Allah is full of kindness to (His) slaves” (Qur’an, 2:207). ET

[175] Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, "If Allah loves a person, He calls Gabriel saying, 'Allah loves so and-so; O Gabriel! Love him.' Gabriel would love him and make an announcement amongst the inhabitants of the Heaven. 'Allah loves so-and-so, therefore you should love him also,' and so all the inhabitants of the Heaven would love him, and then he is granted the pleasure of the people on the earth." ET

[176] The Prophet (s.a.w) used to pray for his companions guidance and to be guides to the right path: Narrated Qais: Jarir said to me, The Prophet said to me, "Won't you relieve me from Dhu-l-Khalasa?" And that was a house (in Yemem belonging to the tribe of) Khatham called Al-Kaba Al Yamaniya. I proceeded with one-hundred and-fifty cavalry from Ahmas (tribe) who were horse riders. I used not to sit firm on horses, so the Prophet stroke me over my chest till I saw the mark of his fingers over my chest, and then he said, 'O Allah! Make him (i.e. Jarir) firm and one who guides others and is guided on the right path." So Jarir proceeded to it dismantled and burnt it, and then sent a messenger to Allah's Apostle. The messenger of Jarir said (to the Prophet), "By Him Who sent you with the Truth, I did not leave that place till it was like a scabby camel." The Prophet blessed the horses of Ahmas and their men five times. ET

[177] The Kutub al-Sittah (or Al-Kutub as-Sittah, lit. 'The six books') are six (originally five) books containing collections of hadith (sayings or acts of the Islamic prophet Muhammad) compiled by six Sunni Muslim scholars in the ninth century CE. They are sometimes referred to as Al-Sihah al-Sittah, which translates as "The Authentic Six". They were first formally grouped and defined by Ibn al-Qaisarani in the 11th century, who added Sunan ibn Majah to the list. [1][2][3] Since then, they have enjoyed near-universal acceptance as part of the official canon of Sunni Islam.

Not all Sunni Muslim jurisprudence scholars agree on the addition of Ibn Majah. In particular, the Malikis and Ibn al-Athir consider al-Mawatta' to be the sixth book. The reason for the addition of Ibn Majah's Sunan is that it contains

many Hadiths which do not figure in the other five, whereas all the Hadiths in the Muwatta' figure in the other Sahih books. Sunni Muslims view the six major hadith collections as their most important, though the order of authenticity varies between Madhabs:

1. Sahih Bukhari, collected by Imam Bukhari (d. 256 AH, 870 CE), includes 7,275 ahadith,
2. Sahih Muslim, collected by Muslim b. al-Hajjaj (d. 261 AH, 875 CE), includes 9,200 ahadith,
3. Sunan Abu Dawood, collected by Abu Dawood (d. 275 AH, 888 CE), includes 4,800 ahadith,
4. Jami al-Tirmidhi, collected by al-Tirmidhi (d. 279 AH, 892 CE), includes 3,956 ahadith,
5. Sunan al-Sughra, collected by al-Nasa'i (d. 303 AH, 915 CE), includes 5,270 ahadith,
6. Either: Sunan ibn Majah, collected by Ibn Majah (d. 273 AH, 887 CE), over 4,000 ahadith or Muwatta Malik, collected by Imam Malik (d. 179 AH, 795 CE), 1,720 ahadith. www.wikipedia.org ET

The first two, commonly referred to as the Two Sahihs as an indication of their authenticity, contain approximately seven thousand hadiths altogether if repetitions are not counted, according to Ibn Hajar.[7]

[178] We read the following from Tafsir Ibn Kathir: Uthman spent large amounts and tremendous wealth on this battle (Tabuk). Abdullah, the son of Imam Ahmad recorded that `Abdur-Rahman bin Khabbab As-Sulami said; "The Messenger of Allah gave a speech in which he encouraged spending on the army of distress (for Tabuk). I (Uthman bin `Affan); 'I will give one hundred camels with their saddles and supplies.' Then he exhorted them some more. So `Uthman said; 'I will give one hundred more camels with their saddles and supplies.' Then he descended one step of the pulpit and exhorted them some more. So `Uthman bin `Affan said; 'I will give one hundred more camels with their saddles and supplies.' Then I saw Allah's Messenger with his hand moving like this - and `Abdus-Samad's - one of the narrators hand went out like one in amazement - he said, (It does not matter what `Uthman does after). It is also recorded in the Musnad that `Abdur-Rahman bin Samurah said, "'Uthman brought a thousand Dinars in his garment so that the Prophet could prepare supplies for the army of distress. `Uthman poured the money on the Prophet's lap, and the Prophet started turning it around with his hand and declaring repeatedly, (The son of `Affan (i.e., `Uthman) will never be harmed by anything he does after today.)"

http://www.qtafsir.com/index.php?id=1580&option=com_content&task=view ET

[179] The full verse is: **"And ask (O Muhammad) those of Our Messengers whom We sent before you: "Did We ever appoint aliha (gods) to be worshipped besides the Most Beneficent (Allah)? (43:45). But Shia**

Rafidah cut it up in order to support their creed for the text will automatically nullify their purpose. ET

[180] Another thing that will show you that this is a fabricated hadith is the following expression: "Fatima grinded one measure and produce out of it five loafs of bread, each one of them will have a loaf." Why shall they give it all out in charity to one person (for three nights) without leaving anything for themselves or for their children? Why is the food prepared for five people given to one person? Didn't the Prophet (s.a.w) said: "The food of two people can be enough for three people... etc.)? ET

[181] In the tenth year of Prophet's mission (620 AD), Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w) met six people from Yathrib (Madina) who had come for the annual rites of pilgrimage at 'Aqaba (near Mina in Makkah). They listened to him earnestly, learnt about Allah (The One God) and His revelations, and immediately recognized him as the prophet mentioned in Jewish scriptures as told by their fellow Jewish citizens. (In times of serious discussions with the Arabs, the Jews of Yathrib used to talk about the coming of a prophet who will lead them to security and dominion in the land.). All six people from Yathrib accepted Islam. They pledged an oath of allegiance to the Prophet and promised to return the next year with more people. Upon their return to Yathrib they described the prophet to the people and soon he became the talk of the town. The following year twelve more men came for the annual rites of pilgrimage and all accepted Islam.

The following hadith was narrated concerning the pledge of Aqaba: "Narrated 'Ubada bin As-Samit: who took part in the battle of Badr and was a Naqib (a person heading a group of six persons), on the night of Al-'Aqaba pledge: Allah's Apostle said while a group of his companions were around him, "Swear allegiance to me for:

1. Not to join anything in worship along with Allah.
2. Not to steal.
3. Not to commit illegal sexual intercourse.
4. Not to kill your children.
5. Not to accuse an innocent person (to spread such an accusation among people).
6. Not to be disobedient (when ordered) to do good deed."

The Prophet added: "Whoever among you fulfills his pledge will be rewarded by Allah. And whoever indulges in any one of them (except the ascription of partners to Allah) and gets the punishment in this world, that punishment will be an expiation for that sin. And if one indulges in any of them, and Allah conceals his sin, it is up to Him to forgive or punish him (in the Hereafter)." 'Ubada bin As-Samit added: "So we swore allegiance for these." (points to Allah's Apostle)" (Bukhari).

The second pledge of Aqaba contained the following conditions for vow of allegiance: "A narration attributed to Jabir ibn Abd-Allah reports: The Ansâr (Helpers) asked the Messenger of Allâh Muhammad about the principles over

which they would take a pledge. The Prophet answered: 1. To listen and obey in all sets of circumstances. 2. To spend in plenty as well as in scarcity. 3. To enjoin good and forbid evil. 4. In Allâh's service, you will fear the censure of none. 5. To defend me in case I seek your help, and debar me from anything you debar yourself, your spouses and children from. And if you observe those precepts, Paradise is in store for you. (Musnad Ahmad).

Some scholars added to the condition the following acts: "Blood is blood and blood not to be paid for is blood not to be paid for. I am of you and you are of me. I will war against them that war against you, and be at peace with those at peace with you.[Refer to Atlas Sirah an-Nabawiyyah by Shawqi Abu Khalil]. ET

[\[182\]](#) In long hadith it was reported that during the Caliphate of Umar a reinforcement from Yemen come for Jihad against the Romans and the Persians and the hadith run as follows: "Usair b. Jabir reported that when people from Yemen came to help (the Muslim army at the time of jihad) he asked them: Is there amongst you Uwais b. 'Amir? (He continued finding him out) until he met Uwais. He said: Are you Uwais b., Amir? He said: Yes. He said: Are you from the tribe of Qaran? He said: Yes. He (Hadrat) 'Umar (again) said: Did you suffer from leprosy and then you were cured from it but for the space of a dirham? He said: Yes. He ('Umar) said: Is your mother (living)? He said: Yes. He ('Umar) said: I heard Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) say: There would come to you Uwais b. Amir with the reinforcement from the people of Yemen. (He would be) from Qaran, (the branch) of Murid. He had been suffering from leprosy from which he was cured but for a spot of a dirham. His treatment with his mother would have been excellent. If he were to take an oath in the name of Allah, He would honour that. And if it is possible for you, then do ask him to beg forgiveness for you (from your Lord). So he (Uwais) begged forgiveness for him. Umar said: Where do you intend to go? He said: To Kufa. He ('Umar) said: Let me write a letter for you to its governor, whereupon he (Uwais) said: I love to live amongst the poor people." (Muslim). ET

[\[183\]](#) Here are some hadiths from Shia sources on the concept of Prophet's household or family: Zaid bin Arqam (R.A) says, the Messenger of Allah said: "Surely, I am leaving among you two weighty things; the first of them is the Book of Allah. Then he said: and members of my household. Hissain asked him: "Who are members of his household O Zaid? Aren't his wives members of his household? He replied: His wives are members of his household and those to whom giving the poor due (Zakkat - charity) to is forbidden (both during his life time) and after him. He asked: Who are they? He replied the family of Ali, the family of Aqil, the family of Ja'afar, and the family of Abbas.

He asked: All of those are forbidden charity? He replied: Yes” (Bihar Anwar, vol. 23, pg. 114).

During the terminal illness of the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W), he heard the sound of weeping and asked: “Who are those (weeping).” They (who are present) replied: “The Ansar.” He asked: “Who are here (present) among members of my household?” They replied: “Ali and Abbas.” So he called them and went out (to meet the Ansar) leaning on them...” (al – Ihtijaj, pg. 43, Bihar Anwar).

On the authority of Salman al – Farisi (R.A) who said: “I was sitting in the company of the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) in the mosque, and Abbas bin Abdilmutallib came in and made salutation. The messenger of Allah replied to his salutation and welcomed him. Then he (Abbas) said: “O Messenger of Allah, with what is Ali made more preferable among us, members of the household and our root is the same?” The Messenger of Allah said: “Then I will tell you O uncle...” (Bihar Anwar, vol. 43, pg. 17). ET

[184] The author is referring the economic and social sanctions against the Muslims and Banu Hashim in order to force them surrender the Prophet (s.a.w) to them. Safiur Rahman Mubakfuri wrote: “The pagans of Makkah held a meeting in a place called the Al-Muhassab valley and formed a confederation hostile to both Bani Hashim and Bani Al-Muttalib. They decided not to have any business dealings with them nor any sort of inter-marriage. Social relations, visits and even verbal contacts with Muhammad (Peace and blessings be upon him) and his supporters would discontinue until the Prophet (Peace and blessings be upon him) was given up to them to be killed.

The articles of their proclamation, which had provided for merciless measures against Bani Hashim, were committed to writing by an idolater, Bagheed ibn ‘Amir ibn Hashim and then suspended in Al-Ka`bah. The Prophet (Peace and blessings be upon him) invoked Allah against Bagheed, whose hand was later paralyzed. (Ibn Al-Qayim, Zad Al-Ma`ad)

Abu Talib wisely and quietly took stock of the situation and decided to withdraw to a valley on the eastern outskirts of Makkah. Families of Banu Hashim and Banu Al-Muttalib, who followed suit, were thus confined within a narrow pass (Shi`b of Abu Talib), from the beginning of Muharram, the seventh year of the Prophet’s mission till the tenth year, that is, a period of three years.

<http://aboutislam.net/shariah/prophet-muhammad/social-boycott-early-muslims-story/> ET

[185]

A former Shia Scholar Ayatullah Borqei stated in his book “Naqd al-Muraja’at”: “This is their scholar, who is considered as the most learned among Shia Imamiyyah of his time – I mean Ayatullah al – Mamqani stating that: ‘Surely

most of what are considered today as fundamental of Shia creed are in the past considered as extremism' (Tanqih al – Maqal, vol.1, pg.212). He means that most of the creeds and beliefs of Shia Imamiyyah today were considered in the early centuries (of Islam) as extremism, but today they are considered as fundamentals of their creed and this is a confession from one of their scholars in the fourteenth century."

Another Shia scholar, Wahid al – Bahbaha'i in his book (al – Fawa'id al – Rijaliyyah, pg.38) stated that: "The past scholars have diverse opinions on issues concerning the Fundamentals of Shia creeds. Many beliefs to some of them are corruption, or unbelief or extremism or predestination or fatalism or ascription of human characters to Allah (anthropomorphization of Allah) etc., but to others they are considered fundamentals of religion which are incumbent upon all believers to have faith in them." These Shia Rafidah scholars are stating that they today extreme Shia without any need for hiding or dissimulation. ET

[186] Ali has testified to this fact as reported in this hadith: Narrated Ibn Abbas: "When (the dead body of) 'Umar was put on his deathbed, the people gathered around him and invoked (Allah) and prayed for him before the body was taken away, and I was amongst them. Suddenly I felt somebody taking hold of my shoulder and found out that he was 'Ali bin Abi Talib. 'Ali invoked Allah's Mercy for 'Umar and said, "O 'Umar! You have not left behind you a person whose deeds I like to imitate and meet Allah with more than I like your deeds. By Allah! I always thought that Allah would keep you with your two companions, for very often I used to hear the Prophet saying, 'I, Abubakar and 'Umar went (somewhere); I, Abubakar and 'Umar entered (somewhere); and I, Abubakar and 'Umar went out" (Bukhari) ET'

[187] Consider this narration and understand the very higher estimation of Abubakar to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w): Narrated Abu Ad-Darda: There was a dispute between Abu Bakr and 'Umar, and Abubakar made Umar angry. So 'Umar left angrily. Abubakar followed him, requesting him to ask forgiveness (of Allah) for him, but 'Umar refused to do so and closed his door in Abubakar's face. So Abubakar went to Allah's Apostle while we were with him. Allah's Apostle said, "This friend of yours must have quarrelled (with somebody)." In the meantime 'Umar repented and felt sorry for what he had done, so he came, greeted (those who were present) and sat with the Prophet and related the story to him. Allah's Apostle became angry and Abubakar started saying, "O Allah's Apostle! By Allah, I was more at fault (than Umar)." Allah's Apostle said, "Are you (people) leaving for me my companion? (Abubakar), Are you (people) leaving for me my companion? When I said, 'O

people I am sent to you all as the Apostle of Allah,' you said, 'You tell a lie.' while Abubakar said, 'You have spoken the truth ." ET

[188] A former Iraqi Shia scholar Sheikh al-Moayyad stated: "Ibn Taimiyyah, may Allah forgive him, has refuted that proof very well and his refutation has benefitted a lot. What I want to add here on what he has disproved are two repudiations. Firstly, the story of "Hadith of Dar" took place according to the narration as an execution of Allah's command by His Messenger (s.a.w) where He commanded: **"And warn your tribe (O Muhammad) of near kindred" (26:214)**. According to this noble verse the command given to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) by his Lord is to warn his people and warning contains threatening and frightening from evil consequences, but the narrations that are talking about the issue from Shia sources are devoid of any warning and instead they are either inciting peoples covetousness and their desires or promising them acquisition of worldly authority or eternal bliss or a warning is mentioned accidentally but the emphasis is on inciting peoples covetousness and their desires or promising them acquisition of worldly authority or eternal bliss. This entailed that the Messenger of Allah has not carried the command of Allah as directed in the above verse (which is impossible), for (according to Shia narrations) while he was inviting his near kindred to Islam instead of warning, threatening and frightening them he was giving them glad tidings and promising them worldly authority. This is false for we cannot envisage the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) shunning the command of his Lord and being short in executing it. This strange case made the narration porous and weak and thus it must be rejected or at least not be mentioned as a proof (of Imamah).

Secondly, it is irrational and inconceivable for the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) to invite his near kindred to listen and obey his successor (as claimed in the narration) after they have rejected him and his mission. Since his near kindred have not accepted him as a Prophet from Allah and have rejected the basis for his call (Islam) to the worship of only One Allah, how can they accept his legatee and the successorship of Ali bin Abi Talib (r.a)? How rational is it for the Messenger of Allah to invite them to believe in his successor after he has seen how they rejected him and his mission (and Prophethood) in (totality)? It is strange for him to talk to them about his successor in a language which showed that it has no relationship with his person and Prophethood for he didn't tell them when they rejected him as a Prophet: I am your Prophet so listen to me and obey me, but he is saying to them after they turned their backs on him and rejected his mission: this is my legatee and successor, who will lead after me, so listen to him and obey him.

Whoever fabricated these hadiths (narrations) has not been successful in putting it together and so he is exposed. Finally it should be noted that the sound, acceptable narrations that are narrated from Ahlus Sunnah sources with regard to the verse of “warning the near kindred” is free from these debates; according to those narrations the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) has rose to the occasion and warned his near kindred as commanded by Allah the Exalted – he rose up, warn them, threatened them and frightened them – and he never incite their covetousness or talk to them about his successor or legatee. (www.almoaiyad.com/mqalat) ET

[189] A former Shia scholar Ali Qaladran stated: “Therefore, what is the relationship between loving and aiding with successorship and leadership? The word (as it appeared in the hadith) “al – Mawla (in Arabic language) is the person who we must love and it’s meaning is not successorship, sovereignty, or authority. Where does the word “Mawla” (friend, client, patron, master of slave, slave, emancipator of slave, neighbor etc.) come with the meaning of the (word) “Awla” (more deserving)? Hasn’t it come in the Qur’an: “**...But if you do not know their fathers, then they are your brothers in faith (Mawalikum)...**” (33:5). Hasn’t it appeared in the chapter of Tahrim (the Prohibition): “**... Then surely! Allah is his protecting friend (Mawlahu)...**” (66:4). Didn’t the word “Mawla” (also) mean overseer and guardian? If we chose this meaning does it mean that the believers are overseers and guardians of the Prophet (S.A.W) – refer to Qur’an, chapter 66:4? What an (incoherent) understanding! Then why doesn’t the Prophet’s companions (R.A) who were addressed by these words in the hadith of Ghadir Khum understand the speech the way Shia Imamiyyah are claiming?

Ibn Asakir related that the grandson of Ali (R.A), Hasan al – Muthanna was asked: Didn’t the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) say: “Whomsoever I am his “mawla” Ali too is his “mawla?” Hasn al – Muthanna replied saying: “I swear by Allah, if the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) had intended with that authority and government over the people after him, he would have stated it more clearly... He would have said to them: Verily this is your “Wali al – „Amr” (ruler) and the man in charge after me. Therefore listen to him and obey. By Allah if the Prophet (S.A.W) has chosen Ali as his successor and leader of the Muslims after him and Ali ignored the command of Allah and His Messenger (S.A.W), then Ali is the first person who abandoned the command of Allah and His Messenger.”

Look at how the grandson of Ali (A.S) judged and thereafter some people will come distorting the message of Ali and his children without giving any regard to that, thereby making their words and opinions more preferable and better than that of Ali (A.S) and his children. In addition to that they ascribed to being

astray most of the Muslims from the first generation to this day. Don't they fear the Judgment of the Hereafter? (Caliphate and Leadership in Islam an objective textual perspective, pg 16-17). ET

[190] Abdullah Yusuf Ali in his translation and commentary Qur'an (pg. 286) commented on the verse thus: "In spiritual relationships the Prophet is entitled to more respect and consideration than blood-relations. The Believers should follow him rather than their fathers or mothers or brothers, where there is conflict of duties. He is even nearer-closer to our real interests-than our own selves." ET

[191] It is not only Ali that made the announcement, but other companions also were appointed by Abubakar to move around and make the announcement: Abu Huraira (Allah be pleased with him) reported: "Abu Bakr Siddiq (Allah be pleased with him) sent me during Hajj before the Farewell Pilgrimage for which Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) had appointed him an Amir, among a group of people whom he had ordered to make announcement to the people on the Day of Nahr: 'After this year no polytheist may perform the Pilgrimage and no naked person may circumambulate the House...'" (Muslim). ET

[192] Ahmad Khatib a former Shia scholar wrote in his book "Development of Shia political thought," (pg. 34-35) explained this concept as follows: The Abbasids who became victorious in the year 132 A.H found themselves in great discomfiture. They dissociated themselves from the old Shiite ideas, and altered their political theory, that is by redesigning the source of the legality of their nascent regime, depending on the right of their grandfather Abbas bin AbdulMutallib to inherit the Prophet (S.A.W) more than his cousin, Ali bin Abi Talib...

Dawud bin Ali, the uncle of the Caliph Abu Abbas has pointed out, in his speech of paying allegiance (bay'ah) to his nephew, to the new source of legality for the Abbasid state, as the inheritance of Abbas. He said, " the Muslims are now in the covenant of Allah. His messenger and Abbas."

Mas'udi mentioned in 'Muruj al-Dhahab' "The Rawandites, who were the Shiites from the children of Abbas from Khurasan and elsewhere used to say: The Messenger of Allah (S.W.T) has died, the most deserving of people for the Imamate after him was Abbas bin Abd al-Mutallib, for he was his uncle, his heir, and the closest of his relatives. Allah has said: "And blood relations among each other have closer personal ties in the Decree of Allah. And people have usurped his right from him, and have done injustice to him, till the time when Allah returned it to them, despite the fact that he has never abandoned the Caliphate. They dissociated themselves from Abu Bakr and Umar. They

legalized the oath of allegiance to Ali bin Abi Talib, due to its legitimization by Abbas, i.e., in his statement “ O my nephew! Come to me I will pay my allegiance to you, so that none will oppose you. Likewise due to the statement of Dawud bin Ali on the pulpit (minbar) of Kufah on the day allegiance was paid to Abu Abbas, “ O people of Kufah, no Imam appeared among you after, the Messenger of Allah, except Ali bin Abi Talib, and the leader among you now i.e. Abu Abbas Al-Saffah.”

The Abbasid Caliph Mahdi Muhammad bin Abi Ja'far Mansur confirmed this theoretical shift, when he established the Imamate of Abbas bin Abd al-Mutallib after the Messenger of Allah, and called the Rawandites to it, and to pay allegiance to him. He said, “Abbas was his uncle his heir and the closest person to him. Definitely Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali, and all those who became Caliphs and claimed Imamate after the Messenger of Allah, were usurpers who jumped to what they have no right on.”

Mahdi established the Imamate and the Khilafah of Abbas bin Abd al-Mutallib after the Prophet (peace be upon him), for his companions and allies, as well as the Muslim community (Ummah). He then established it for Abdullah bin Abbas, after the death of Abbas. After Abdullah he established for Ali bin Abdullah known as Sajjad and after him, for Muhammad bin Ali bin Abdullah, and then for Ibrahim bin Muhammad, known as the Imam, and after him for his brother Abdullah bin Muhammad Al-Saffah, then for his brother Abdullah Mansur, the father of Mahdi.” See also footnote number 29. ET

[193] Sheikh Moayyad a former Iraqi Shia scholar stated: “Undoubtedly among the proofs that are affirming the total negation of Shia hypothesis of Imamah and legatees and which their scholars are claiming to be a continuation of Prophethood is the words of Allah the Exalted: “On the Day when Allah will gather the Messengers together and say to them: "What was the response you received (from men to your teaching)? They will say: "We have no knowledge, verily, only You are the AllKnower of all that is hidden (or unseen, etc.)” (5:109). The verse has confined, restricted and directed its question to only the Prophets, so if to say that the Prophets have legatees or there are Imams (leaders) who have been appointed by Allah to succeed the Prophets or that there are some legatees or appointees who are considered as continuation of Prophethood, the question would not have been confined and restricted to the Prophets only, it would have been imperative to also ask the Imams. This is because according to Shia claims and premises the Imam are carrying out all the Divine responsibilities of Prophets by Allah's command. This demand is authoritative especially if the Noble verse purpose of asking the question is to know the condition of their communities after them. In this instance it is better

and more befitting to ask the Imams who were appointed by Allah as a continuation of Prophethood and because they are the ones who will continue to shoulder all the responsibilities of the Prophets as per the above mentioned claim. This is how we arrived at the fact that the above verse is one of the proofs that negated the concepts of Imamah and legatees as being championed by the proponents of Shia creed.” (www.almoaiyad.com/mqalat). ET

[194] Sheikh Moayyad a former Iraqi Shia scholar stated: “Undoubtedly among the proofs that are affirming the total negation of Shia hypothesis of Imamah and legatees and which their scholars are claiming to be a continuation of Prophethood is the words of Allah the Exalted: **“On the Day when Allah will gather the Messengers together and say to them: ‘What was the response you received (from men to your teaching)?’ They will say: ‘We have no knowledge, verily, only You are the AllKnower of all that is hidden (or unseen, etc.)’” (5:109).** The verse has confined, restricted and directed its question to only the Prophets, so if to say that the Prophets have legatees or there are Imams (leaders) who have been appointed by Allah to succeed the Prophets or that there are some legatees or appointees who are considered as continuation of Prophethood, the question would not have been confined and restricted to the Prophets only, it would have been imperative to also ask the Imams. This is because according to Shia claims and premises the Imam are carrying out all the Divine responsibilities of Prophets by Allah’s command. This demand is authoritative especially if the Noble verse purpose of asking the question is to know the condition of their communities after them. In this instance it is better and more befitting to ask the Imams who were appointed by Allah as a continuation of Prophethood and because they are the ones who will continue to shoulder all the responsibilities of the Prophets as per the above mentioned claim. This is how we arrived at the fact that the above verse is one of the proofs that negated the concepts of Imamah and legatees as being championed by the proponents of Shia creed.” (www.almoaiyad.com/mqalat). ET

[195] Ibn Kathir in Al-Bidaya 7/377 quoted Al-Thahabi’s opinion of the narrations of the bird from his book. He said, “All of them are ninety something, the best are weak strange ones, and the worst are fabricated paths, and most of them are just soft.” ET

[196] The singularly radiant are members of the Prophet’s community (Muslims) who will be raised on the Day of Judgment with white (radiant) marks on their foreheads, hands and feet due to ablution and the Messenger of Allah will lead them to the Hawd (cistern) (Bukhari, Muwatta). Thus, the Master of the singularly radiant is the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and not Ali (r.a), but the conduct of Shia Rafida at all times is to place Ali (r.a) above his

station and to divert virtues of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) (and those of his companions – r.a) to him, for to them Islam revolve around the person of Ali (r.a) and not Allah and his Messenger (and Qur'an and Sunnah of His Messenger). In a hadith the Messenger of Allah said: "On the Day of Resurrection my followers will be called the singularly radiant from the traces of ablution and whoever can increase the area of his radiance should do so (i.e. by performing ablution regularly or by increasing the extent of the areas washed during ablution) (Bukhari, Muslim). Thus the Messenger of Allah is the Master of the singularly radiants. ET

[197] Ahlus Sunnah agree that those who follow the prophet's household's footsteps will be victorious and those who imitates them are correct; but what is the relationship of these extremists Shia whose creeds are nothing but innovation, unbelief and misguidance with those honorable, upright men? The truth is that the Ahlus – Sunnah are the true followers of members of the Prophet's household; they are following in their footsteps and harkening to their calls. The pure Imams (scholars) of the Prophet's household have been on the path which Ahlus – Sunnah are today. The Prophet (s.a.w) is the master, leader, and chief of the Ahlul Bait (his household and progeny) and we are his followers. We thank Allah for these Favors. ET

[198] Mursal refers to a report whose isnad (chain of transmission) is interrupted, meaning that among its narrators is one who did not hear it from the one whose name comes before his. But in most cases, what is described as mursal is that which was narrated by the Taabi'i from the Prophet (s.a.w) (Al-Kifayah, p. 21.). ET

[199] Ibn Asakir related that the grandson of Ali (R.A), Hasan al – Muthanna was asked: Didn't the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) say: "Whomsoever I am his 'mawla' Ali too is his 'mawla'?" Hasn al – Muthanna replied saying: 'I swear by Allah, if the Messenger of Allah (S.A.W) had intended with that authority and government over the people after him, he would have stated it more clearly... He would have said to them: Verily this is your 'Wali al – 'Amr' (ruler) and the man in charge after me. Therefore listen to him and obey. By Allah if the Prophet (S.A.W) has chosen Ali as his successor and leader of the Muslims after him and Ali ignored the command of Allah and His Messenger (S.A.W), then Ali is the first person who abandoned the command of Allah and His Messenger." ET

[200] According to the Shia scholars, The Science of Hadith in the Madhab of The Twelvers has never existed nor was it implemented before the 900s Hijri. The Big Scholar Al Ha'iri In His book Muktabas el Athar part 3 page 73 says: "From the Information that No One doubts is that No one worked in The Science of Hadith from our scholars before the second Shaheed." And the

second Shaheed is Al Hassan Bin ZaynulDeen al Jab'ee al Amili (Died 965 hijri).

In Wasael el Shia 30/258 The Scholar Al Hurr al Amili (died 1104 h) says That The Only reason for writing the Isnad is because They were being accused by the Sunnah of Making up the Hadiths and attributing them to the Imams.

So Basically they did it later because they didn't want the Muslims to criticize them and not for the purpose of actually learning the True Hadiths from the False ones and this is why they have a very weak science of Hadith and their books are full of contradictions, they never wanted the truth but just to escape criticism by their "enemies."

Sheikh Baqir el Ayruwani Says in his book Durros Tamhidiyah fil Uloom el Rijaliyah Page 86 "The Only Reason Why Al Najashi Wrote his Book is because the Muslims Said That The Shiites never had a Salaf or Musannaf."

Al Hurr al Amili said while he Discussed about The Second Shahid (as-Shahid ath-Thani):

"And he is the First to implement this science of Hadith from our scholars but he took The Laws and Rules from the Books of the Main Stream Muslims as His Son and Others Mentioned.

source: Amal el Amil "" Part 1 Page 86.

Al hurr Al Amili says in Wasael el Shia 30 / 259 "The Method of the First Shii Scholars is different from that of the Mainstream Muslims, But The New Methods are In Accordance to what The Mainstream Muslims use But It is Also taken from thier books as it is apparent from the investigation and what sheikh Hassan and others said."

<https://islamistruth.wordpress.com/2014/05/08/why-shia-hadiths-shouldnt-be-trusted-taken/#more-3928> ET

[201] Here is what some Shia scholars are saying about their books of hadiths and narrators of their hadiths: Al Shareef al Murtadah Destroys the Entire Madhab when he says that the shii Hadiths can never be used as a Hujja(Proof) on anyone nor did the scholars know what a Hujja Is: "Leave us from the books of The shii Scholars of Hadith, for they serve no Hujja and none of them know what is a Hujja nor were these books even made for Ihtijaj(Hujja)." (reference: Rasa'el al Shareef el murtada 3/311 Copied from the book Madkhal Ila Fahm al Islam for Yahya Muhammad P393).

Allamah Abdullah al Mamaqani died 1351 hijri says: "In Many of the Isnads there is error and Confusion between names of Men and thier fathers or thier nicknames and titles" (Source: Tankeeh el Maqal fi Ilm al Rijjal 1/177).

Muhammad el Hussainy in his book "Buhooth fi Ilm al Rijjal the time of companions of Muhammad PBUH or Ali PBUH or the Imams PBUH so that

their narrations could come directly from them. So Either their weakening or strengthening of Hadith is just from guess work or personal Ijtihad or transmitted one by one until they reach the imam, However It is not a Hujja on us because it is mostly hearsay...”

Big Scholar Al Bahbahani Says: “There is no doubt that most of the Fiqh does not come from a Sahih Hadith, and those who are narrated by sahih are not free from big errors in Isnad and Matn and Dilalah” (Source: Fawa’ed Ha’ariyah P 488).

Al Hurr al Amili Says in Wasael al Shia 30/206: “And Wise Trustworthy scholars all narrate from the weak and the liars and the Unknown personalities and they know of this yet they still narrate from them. He also stated in 30 / 244: “It is Known to all that the Main books who belonged to our scholars had an enormous amount of Liars and Unknown personalities as their narrators as well as many weak ones.”

Hashim ma’arouf Husni then says in his book “Dirasat Fi al Kafi lil Kulayni” P43: “The Sahih for the early scholars is what is found to be correct (Doesn’t say how) even if it does not take into consideration all the rules of Isnad which we mentioned.”

Al Shareef al Murtada Says: “From where can we get one Sahih Narration from those who could be classified as “Just? ” (Rasa’el al Shareef al murtada 3/310).

Al Tusi Says In Tahtheeb al Ahkam Vol.1, pg. 2: “We have No Hadith Unless there is another which contradicts it and no Hadith is safe from another which negates it”. <https://islamistruth.wordpress.com/2014/05/08/why-shia-hadiths-shouldnt-be-trusted-taken/#more-3928> ET

[202] Asma bint Umays had been the wife of Jafar ibn Abi Talib, the brother of Ali; After Jafar died, she married Abu Bakr and bore him a son whom he called Muhammad. When Abu Bakr died, Ali Ibn Abi Talib married her and she bore him a son whom he called Yahya This same Muhammad (who grew up in his house) was appointed by Ali as the governor of Egypt. (al-Bidayah Wan-Nihayah). ET

[203]

A former Shia scholar (quoting from Shia sources) Ahmad Khatib wrote in his book “Development of Shiite Political Thoughts” (pg.12-13): The belief of Imam Ali in Shura (Consultation) as a constitution for the Muslims, became very clear in the process of the Caliphate of Imam Hassan when the Muslims came to him after the strike of Abdul Rahman bin Muljan on him, and requested him to appoint his son Hassan after him (as the leader),

for he said “No, we did go to the Prophet of Allah and said,” Appoint (for us a leader), and he said” No, I fear that you will be divided on his affairs, as Harun, but if Allah finds any good in your hearts, he will choose for you’ They requested him to point to someone, but he did not . They then said to him,” If we lost you, we will not lose giving our oath of allegiance to Hassan. He said, “I do not command, nor prevent you, you can discern better” (Murtada: Al-Shafi, vol. 3 p. 295, Tathbit Dala'il al-Nubuwwah, vol.1 p.221).

Hafiz Abu Bakr Ibn Abi al-Dunya (208-281) has mentioned in the book titled “The Murder of Imam, the Commander of the Faithful, from Abdul Rahman bin Jundub from his father who said “I said “O! Commander of the faithful, if we lose you (if you die) and we will not lose, we will give our oath of allegiance to Hassan. He said, “I will not command you (to do that) nor prevent you”. I repeated what I said and he replied in the same way” (Tathbit Dala'il al-Nubuwwah, p. 43).

Sheikh Hassan bin Sulaiman has mentioned in 'Mukhtasar Basair al-Darajat' from Salim bin Qays al- Hilali, who said “I heard Ali saying, while in the company of his two sons and Abdullah bin Ja'far and some of his close associates (supporters) ‘ Leave people with what they have chosen for themselves, and maintain your silence” (Majlisi, vol. 7). ET

[204] When Umar was stabbed he said to his son: “Umar further said, "O 'Abdullah bin 'Umar! See how much I am in debt to others." When the debt was checked, it amounted to approximately eighty-six thousand. 'Umar said, "If the property of 'Umar's family covers the debt, then pay the debt thereof; otherwise request it from Bani 'Adi bin Ka'b, and if that too is not sufficient, ask for it from Quraish tribe, and do not ask for it from any one else, and pay this debt on my behalf" (Bukhari). ET

[205] Narrated 'Ali bin Abi Talib: Fatima came to the Prophet asking for a servant. He said, "May I inform you of something better than that? When you go to bed, recite "Subhan Allah' thirty three times, 'Alhamdulillah' thirty three times, and 'Allahu Akbar' thirty four times. 'All added, 'I have never failed to recite it ever since." Somebody asked, "Even on the night of the battle of Siffin?" He said, "No, even on the night of the battle of Siffin." ET

[206] The context of the verse is as follows: “Verily! When the water rose beyond its limits (Noah Flood), We carried you (mankind) in the floating (ship that was constructed by Noah). That We might make it a remembrance for you, and the keen ear (person) may (hear and) understand it” (69:11-12). ET

[207] The meaning of is bravery (in Arabic dictionary. Al-Jawhari says in 'As-Sihaah' vol. 3, pg. 1235):" "It is the stability of heart during trial."Even the English word bravery means 'able or ready to face and endure danger, disgrace or pain'. So not being able to kill someone or not being able to conquer some place does not indicate cowardice. Ibn Taimiyyah said: "...And bravery is defined by two things:

- a) the strength and firmness of the heart in the face of fears, and
- b) physical strength when fighting, such that one can kill with immense force and magnitude.

The first is the definition of bravery. As for the latter, it indicates physical strength and ability, and not everyone who possesses physical strength has strength of heart, and vice versa.

Because of this, you may find that it is said regarding a man who kills many people: 'He would do this if he had with him those who could guarantee his safety.' But, if he becomes scared, he is stricken with cowardice, and his heart becomes detached. And you would find the man with a firm heart who has not killed many people with his own hands firm in the face of fears, going forth in the face of hardships, and this is a characteristic that is required by the commanders, leaders, and forerunners of war, more so than the other, as the forerunner, if he is brave and firm at heart, will go forth and remain firm and will not be defeated, and his supporters will fight alongside him. If he was a coward and weak at heart, he will be humiliated, will not go forth, and will not remain firm, even if he is physically strong.

And the Prophet was the most complete in regards to this bravery that is appropriate for the commanders in war, and he did not kill with his hand anyone except Ubayy bin Khalaf. He killed him on the day of Uhud, and did not kill anyone else with his hand before or after this" ['Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyyah'; 8/78].

[208] Allah said: "Those of you who turned back on the day the two hosts met (i.e. the battle of Uhud), it was Shaitan (Satan) who caused them to backslide (run away from the battlefield) because of some (sins) they had earned. But Allah, indeed, has forgiven them. Surely, Allah is OftForgiving, Most Forbearing" (5:155).

[209] Narrated Al-Bara: We faced the pagans on that day (of the battle of Uhud) and the Prophet placed a batch of archers (at a special place) and appointed 'Abdullah (bin Jubair) as their commander and said, "Do not leave this place; and if you should see us conquering the enemy, do not leave this place, and if you should see them conquering us, do not (come to) help us," So, when we faced the enemy, they took to their heel till I saw their women running towards

the mountain, lifting up their clothes from their legs, revealing their leg-bangles. The Muslims started saying, "The booty, the booty!" 'Abdullah bin Jubair said, "The Prophet had taken a firm promise from me not to leave this place." But his companions refused (to stay). So when they refused (to stay there), (Allah) confused them so that they could not know where to go, and they suffered seventy casualties. Abu Sufyan ascended a high place and said, "Is Muhammad present amongst the people?" The Prophet said, "Do not answer him." Abu Sufyan said, "Is the son of Abu Quhafa present among the people?" The Prophet said, "Do not answer him." Abd Sufyan said, "Is the son of Al-Khattab amongst the people?" He then added, "All these people have been killed, for, were they alive, they would have replied." On that, 'Umar could not help saying, "You are a liar, O enemy of Allah! Allah has kept what will make you unhappy." Abu Safyan said, "Superior may be Hubal!" On that the Prophet said (to his companions), "Reply to him." They asked, "What may we say?" He said, "Say: Allah is More Elevated and More Majestic!" Abu Sufyan said, "We have (the idol) Al-'Uzza, whereas you have no 'Uzza!" The Prophet said (to his companions), "Reply to him." They said, "What may we say?" The Prophet said, "Say: Allah is our Helper and you have no helper." Abu Sufyan said, "(This) day compensates for our loss at Badr and (in) the battle (the victory) is always undecided and shared in turns by the belligerents. You will see some of your dead men mutilated, but neither did I urge this action, nor am I sorry for it." Narrated Jabir: Some people took wine in the morning of the day of Uhud and were then killed as martyrs" (Bukhari).

Many people have sacrificed themselves on that day to defend the Messenger of Allah: At the Battle of Uhud, when the Muslims fell into disarray at the beginning of hostilities, the Prophet became dangerously exposed. There were about eleven men of the Ansar at his side and one Muhajir - Talha ibn 'Ubaydullah. The Prophet clambered up the mountain hotly pursued by some mushrikin. The Prophet, peace be upon him, shouted: 'The one who repulses these people from us will be my companion in Paradise.' 'I, O Messenger of God,' shouted Talha.

'No, stick to your position,' replied the Prophet. A man from the Ansar volunteered and the Prophet agreed. He fought until he was killed. The Prophet went further up the mountain with the mushrikin still in close pursuit. 'Isn't there someone to combat these?'

Talha again volunteered but the Prophet ordered him to maintain his position. Another person immediately came forward, fought and was killed. This happened until all who stood by the Prophet were martyred except Talha.

'Now, yes, ' signalled the Prophet and Talha went into battle. By this time, the Prophet's teeth had been broken, his forehead had been slashed, his lips had been wounded and blood was streaming down his face. He was drained of

energy. Talha plunged into the enemy and pushed them away from the Prophet. He turned back to the Prophet and helped him a little further up the mountain and put him to lie on the ground. He then renewed his attack and successfully repulsed the enemy.

Sa'id bin Al-Musayyib said, "I heard Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas saying, 'The Messenger of Allah gave me arrows from his quiver on the day of Uhud and said, 'Shoot, may I sacrifice my father and mother for you.'" ET

[210] It come in sound hadith as follows: Narrated Abu Hazim: That he heard Sahl bin Sad being asked about the wounds of Allah's Apostle saying, "By Allah, I know who washed the wounds of Allah's Apostle and who poured water (for washing them), and with what he was treated." Sahl added, "Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle used to wash the wounds, and 'Ali bin Abi Talib used to pour water from a shield. When Fatima saw that the water aggravated the bleeding, she took a piece of a mat, burnt it, and inserted its ashes into the wound so that the blood was congealed (and bleeding stopped). His canine tooth got broken on that day, and face was wounded, and his helmet was broken on his head." ET

[211] Allah said: "He it is Who drove out the disbelievers among the People of the Scripture" (59:2), referring to the Jewish tribe of Bani An-Nadir, according to Ibn 'Abbas, Mujahid, Az-Zuhri and several others. When the Messenger of Allah migrated to Al-Madinah, he made a peace treaty with the Jews stipulating that he would not fight them and they would not fight him. They soon betrayed the treaty that they made with Allah's Messenger . Therefore, Allah sent His torment down on them; it can never be averted, and His appointed destiny touched them; it can never be resisted.

The Prophet forced them to evacuate and abandon their fortified forts that Muslims did not think they would ever control. The Jews thought that their fortifications will save them from Allah's torment, but they did not help them against Allah in the least. Then, that which they did not expect came to them from Allah, and Allah's Messenger forced them to leave Al-Madinah. Some of them went to Adhri'at in the area of Syria..., while others went to Khaibar. The Prophet allowed them to evacuate their forts and take whatever their camels could carry. They destroyed the property that they could not carry. This is why Allah the Exalted said, (they demolished their own dwellings with their own hands and the hands of the believers Then take admonition, O you with eyes.) meaning, "Contemplate the end of those who defied Allah's command, contradicted His Messenger and denied His Book. See how Allah's humiliating torment struck them in this life, as well as, the painful torment that Allah has

reserved for them in the Hereafter.”
<https://abdurrahman.org/2014/01/27/expulsionofbaninadir/> (Culled from Tafsir Ibn Kathir). ET

[212] Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar said, commenting on the meaning of this hadith: The words “He who exposes himself to them” mean, the one who wants to find out about them and does not want to ignore them. “will be drawn to them” means: they will destroy him, because he will expose himself to destruction because of them. “whoever find a refuge from them” means a place where he may seek refuge from the evil (of these turmoil). “let him seek protection therein” means: let him withdraw to that place so that he may be safe from the evil of the turmoil. The explanation of this hadith is also found in Sahih Muslim, in the hadith of Abubakar, which says: **“When they come, whoever has camels let him stay with his camels,” -- and he mentioned sheep and land. A man said: O Messenger of Allaah, what do you think if he does not have camels or sheep or land? He said: “Let him go to his sword and make it blunt with a stone, then let him try to find a way of escape if he can.”** (Fath al-Baari (13/30); see also Sharh Muslim by al-Nawawi, 18/9).

What is meant by these tribulations is what will happen among the Muslims of fighting, hatred and enmity, or disputes over worldly matters, without stating which of the two parties is in the right or which is in the wrong. Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar said: With regard to the words “one who sitting is better than one who is standing”, Ibn al-Teen narrated from al-Dawoodi that it seems that what is meant is those who are fully involved in the turmoil and is part of it, i.e., some of them will be more involved in that than others. The highest of them in that will be the one who is running, who will be a cause of stirring them up; then comes the one who is keeping them going, and he is the one who is walking. Then comes the one who is involved in them, and he is the one who is standing. Then comes the one who is just looking on, and does not fight, and he is the one who is sitting. Then comes the one who is avoiding it, and is neither involved nor looking on, and he is the one who is lying down yet is awake. Then comes the one who does not do any of that, but he accepts it, and he is the one who is sleeping. What is meant by this listing of who is superior in goodness is the one who is less evil than the one above him in the details mentioned. This is a warning against tribulation and encourages us to avoid getting involved in it, and it tells us that its evil that a person may acquire from it will be according to how much he is involved in it.” (Fath al-Baari, 13/30-31). <https://islamqa.info/en/141077> ET

[213] Ali (r.a) said after performing funeral prayers and interment of his brothers Talha and Zubair (r.a): "I really hope," he said in simple and sublime words, "that Talhah, Zubayr, Uthman and I will be among those of whom God has

said: **'And We shall remove from their hearts any lurking sense of injury and rancor; they will be brothers joyfully facing each other on thrones of dignity'**" (The Quran, Surah al-Hijr, 15:47). Then he looked tenderly and sorrowfully on the graves of his brothers in faith and said: "I have heard with these two ears of mine the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace, saying: ***"Talhah and Zubayr are my companions in Paradise!"***"
ET

[214] The full story of Yusha ibn Nun is told to us in a sahih hadith of the Prophet (s.a.w), recorded in Sahih Muslim 19/4327. The Prophet, sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam, said: "One of the Prophets made a holy war. He said to his followers: 'One who has married a woman and wants to consummate to his marriage but has not yet done so; another who has built a house but has not yet erected its roof; and another who has bought goats and pregnant she-camels and is waiting for their offspring-will not accompany me ...'" This Prophet did not want any person to come with him whose heart may be attached to anything else. This is a Prophet who is not looking for numbers but rather for ikhlas (sincerity).

The Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w), continued: " ... So he marched on and approached a village at or about the time of the Asr prayers. He said to the Sun: 'You are receiving orders and I am receiving orders from Allah, O Allah stop the sun!' It was stopped for him until Allah granted him victory." We know this Prophet was Yusha ibn Nun because of a separate narration recorded by Imam Ahmad in which the Prophet, sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam, said:

"The sun has never stopped for any man besides Yusha when he wanted to conquer Bayt al-Muqaddis (Jerusalem)."

<http://sunnahonline.com/library/stories-of-the-prophets/621-story-of-yusha-ibn-nun-joshua-the> ET

[215] It was narrated by Ibn Abbas was asked concerning eating scaleless fishes and he replied: "It is something that has been forbidden by the Jews." It come in the Bible: "These you may eat of all that are in the water: whatever in the water has fins and scales, whether in the seas or in the rivers—that you may eat. **But all in the seas or in the rivers that do not have fins and scales, all that move in the water or any living thing which is in the water, they are [an abomination to you. They shall be an abomination to you; you shall not eat their flesh, but you shall regard their carcasses as an abomination. Whatever in the water does not have fins or scales—that shall be an abomination to you]**" (King James Version, Leviticus, 11:9-12).

ET

[216] Narrated Anas: When Abubakar; sent me to (collect the Zakat from) Bahrein, he wrote to me the following:-- (In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful). These are the orders for compulsory charity (Zakat) which Allah's Apostle had made obligatory for every Muslim, and which Allah had ordered His Apostle to observe: Whoever amongst the Muslims is asked to pay Zakat accordingly, he should pay it (to the Zakat collector) and whoever is asked more than that (what is specified in this script) he should not pay it; for twenty-four camels or less, sheep are to be paid as Zakat; for every five camels one sheep is to be paid, and if there are between twenty-five to thirty-five camels, one Bint Makhad is to be paid; and if they are between thirty-six to forty-five (camels), one Bint Labun is to be paid; and if they are between forty-six to sixty (camels), one Hiqqa is to be paid; and if the number is between sixty-one to seventy-five (camels), one Jadh'a is to be paid; and if the number is between seventy-six to ninety (camels), two Bint Labuns are to be paid; and if they are from ninety-one to one-hundred-and twenty (camels), two Hiqqas are to be paid; and if they are over one-hundred and-twenty (camels), for every forty (over one-hundred-and-twenty) one Bint Labun is to be paid, and for every fifty camels (over one-hundred-and-twenty) one Hiqqa is to be paid; and who ever has got only four camels, has to pay nothing as Zakat, but if the owner of these four camels wants to give something, he can. If the number of camels increases to five, the owner has to pay one sheep as Zakat. As regards the Zakat for the (flock) of sheep; if they are between forty and one-hundred-and-twenty sheep, one sheep is to be paid; and if they are between one-hundred-and-twenty to two hundred (sheep), two sheep are to be paid; and if they are between two-hundred to three-hundred (sheep), three sheep are to be paid; and for over three-hundred sheep, for every extra hundred sheep, one sheep is to be paid as Zakat. And if somebody has got less than forty sheep, no Zakat is required, but if he wants to give, he can. For silver the Zakat is one-fortieth of the lot (i.e. 2.5%), and if its value is less than two-hundred Dirhams, Zakat is not required, but if the owner wants to pay he can" (Bukhari). ET

[217] since the previous paragraph Ibn Taimiyyah has rejected the narration that suggests that Abubakar mistreated those that were with Fatima. He argues, "The incrimination cannot be accepted without an authentic chain and needs to be a clear evidence for incrimination, and if one of the two is missing, one cannot be incriminated."

Ibn Taymiyyah then proceeds by suggesting that even if we were to accept that he entered the house of Fatima, it was not for the sake of harming anyone, since the narration does not state that, but rather, that he was looking

for money to be distributed, since that is why houses are barged into. We remind readers again that this narration has not been affirmed as authentic in the first place (and therefore, this suggestion is faulty).

<http://www.twelvershia.net/2016/04/23/response-to-why-abubakr-attacked-fatimas-house-ibn-taymiyyah/> ET

[218] The Shia Rafida are saying that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) intended to free Madina from his companions so that the vow of allegiance will be taken for Ali (r.a) as his successor! What kind of humiliation and betrayal of trust are they (Shia Rafida) accusing the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) and his religion (that he cannot be able to make a policy statement or take an action for fear of his companions)? ET

[219] We shall mention here the story of how ‘Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) swore allegiance to Abubakar as-Siddeeq on the first day. Ibn Kathir (may Allah have mercy on him) said: al-Haafiz Abu Bakr al-Bayhaqi said: Abu’l-Hasan ‘Ali ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Ali al-Hafiz al-Isfarayani informed us: Abu ‘Ali al-Husayn ibn ‘Ali al-Hafiz told us: Abubakar Muhammad ibn Ishaq ibn Khuzaymah and Ibraaheem ibn Abi Taalib told us: Bandar ibn Bashir told us: Abu Hishaam al-Makhzumi told us: Wuhaib told us: Dawud ibn Abi Hind told us: Abu Nadrah told us, from Abu Sa‘id al-Khudri, who said:

The Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) passed away and the people, including Abubakar and ‘Umar, gathered in the house of Sa‘ad ibn ‘Ubadah. The spokesman of the Ansar stood up and said: Do you know that the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) was one of the Muhaajireen, and his successor is one of the Muhaajireen, and we are the Ansar (helpers) of the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him), and we will be the Ansar (helpers) of his successor as we were his helpers?

‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab stood up and said Your spokesman has spoken the truth. If you had said something other than this, we would not have accepted that. And he took the hand of Abubakar and said: This is the right man, so swear allegiance to him. ‘Umar swore allegiance to him, and the Muhaajireen and Ansar swore allegiance to him.

Then Abubakar ascended the minbar and looked at the people, and he did not see Zubayr. So he called for az-Zubayr, and he came. Abubakar said: (You are) the son of the paternal aunt of the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) and his disciple; do you want to cause division among the Muslims? He said: There is nothing to worry about, O successor of the Messenger of Allah. Then he stood up and swore allegiance to him.

Then Abubakar looked at the people, and he did not see 'Ali, so he called 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and he came. Abu Bakr said: (You are) the son of the paternal uncle of the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) and his son-in-law; do you want to cause division among the Muslims? He said: There is nothing to worry about, O successor of the Messenger of Allah. Then he stood up and swore allegiance to him.

Abu 'Ali al-Hafiz said: I heard Muhammad ibn Ishaq ibn Khuzaimah say: Muslim ibn al-Hajjaaj came to me and asked me about this hadith, so I wrote it down for him on a piece of paper and I read it to him. This hadith is worth a badanah (a valuable camel); indeed it is worth a badrah (sack of money)!" (al-Bidayah wa'n-Nihayah by Ibn Kathir (5/269). A badrah is a big sack full of money; it was said that it is one thousand or ten thousand dirhams, or seven thousand dinars. (Al-Mu'jam al-Waseet p. 43; al-Qaamoos al-Muheet p. 444).

Then Ibn Kathir narrated a report about another oath of allegiance that 'Ali swore after the death of Faatimah (may Allah be pleased with her). He said: This oath of allegiance that was sworn by 'Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) to Abubakar (may Allah be pleased with him) after the death of Fatima (may Allah be pleased with her) was in confirmation of the reconciliation between them and it was secondary to the oath of allegiance mentioned above, that was sworn on the day of as-saqeefah, as was narrated by Ibn Khuzaymah and classed as saheeh by Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj. 'Ali did not keep his distance from Abubakar, during these six months; rather he used to pray behind him, and he was present when Abu Bakr used to meet with some of the senior Sahaabah in order to seek their advice concerning some issues; he was also willing to ride with him on a campaign to Dhu'l-Qassah.

In Sahih al-Bukhari it says that Abubakar (may Allah be pleased with him) prayed 'Asr a few days after the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) died, then he went out of the mosque and found al-Hasan ibn 'Ali playing with some boys. He carried him on his shoulder and started saying: May my father be sacrificed for the one who looks like the Prophet and does not look like 'Ali! And 'Ali smiled (at this joke).

But when this second oath of allegiance occurred, some narrators thought that 'Ali had not sworn allegiance (to Abu Bakr) before that, so they denied that (the first oath of allegiance) had happened. But if someone confirms that something happens, that takes precedence over the report of someone who says that it did not happen, as we have mentioned and explained above. And Allah knows best. (al-Bidayah wan-Nihayah 5/307).

<https://islamqa.info/en/256101> ET

[220] Shia reported in their book “Nahjul Balagah,” (Sermon No. 172) that Ali bin Abi Talib stated concerning this principle: “O' people. the most rightful of all persons for this matter (namely the caliphate) is he who is most competent among them to maintain it, and he who knows best Allah's commands about it. If any mischief is created by a mischief-monger, he will be called upon to repent. If he refuses. he will be fought. By my life, if the question of Imamah was not to be decided unless all the people were present, then there would be no such case. But those who agreed about it imposed the decision on those who were absent, so much so that he who was present could not dissent and the one who was absent could not choose (anyone else). Know that I shall fight two persons - one who claims what is not his and the other who ignores what is obligatory upon him... The door of war has been opened between you and the other Muslims. And this banner will be borne only by him who is a man of sight, of endurance and of knowledge of the position of rightfulness.” ET

[221] In the book of Shia Nahjul Balagah (pg. 165), Ali bin Abi Talib talked about consensus as the agreement of the overwhelming majority of the Muhajirun and Ansar on an issue, he said: “Verily, those who took the oath of allegiance to Abubakar, Umar and Uthman have sworn allegiance to me. Now those who were present at the election have no right to go back against their oaths of allegiance and those who were not present on the occasion have no right to oppose me. And so far as Shura (consultation) was concerned it was supposed to be limited to Muhajirs and Ansars and it was also supposed that whomsoever they selected, became caliph as per approval and pleasure of Allah. If somebody goes against such decision, then he should be persuaded to adopt the course followed by others, and if he refuses to fall in line with others, then war is the only course left open to be adopted against him and as he has refused to follow the course followed by the Muslims, Allah will let him wander in the wilderness of his ignorance and schism.”

Some Shia scholars argued that the above statement is only a point of arguing with the opponent on what he believed! But can Imam Ali (r.a) lie against Allah by saying whatever the companions agreed upon is right “**...as per the approval and pleasure of Allah?**” Can he legalize war against whoever contradicts the consensus of the companions wrongly? Is it not better for him at this junction to argue that he is the divinely appointed Imam and to cite his reasons?

Can Imam Ali (r.a) – Allah forbid – swear by Allah in falsehood? Contrary to Shia believe, Imam Ali (r.a) believed that the only way to chose a person to the

leadership of the Muslim Community is through consultation and the power to select a leader belong to the Muhajirin and Ansar. When the commander of the faithful Uthman bin Affan (r.a) was murdered in cold blood the rebels came to Ali (r.a) asking him to take over authority but he refused saying to them: **“This is not of your power, this is for the Muhajirin and Ansar, whoever they chose as a leader will be the leader”** (Tabari). When the Muhajirin and Ansar asked him to be the leader, he replied them saying: **“Leave me alone and look for another person... I would be most obedient and loyal to anyone you chose to conduct your affairs, for me to be your vizier (adviser) is better for you than to be your leader”** (Nahjul balagah, Tabari). It was reported that he offered the leadership to Talha (r.a), then to Zubair (r.a) and both did not accept it. Thereafter he said to the Muhajirin and Ansar; vows will be taken in the Mosque and not in secret. That has been the conduct and behavior of Imam Ali (r.a) throughout his life for before his death people requested him to name someone as his successor but he refused and when they suggested Hasan (r.a) he replied: **“...I do not command you, nor prevent you, you understand better your affairs”** (al-Shafi, vol. 3, pg. 295 by Murtada). ET

[222] “... Abu Hurayra says, ‘I swear by the being besides whom none other is worthy of worship that none would have been worshipping Allah had Abubakar not been appointed as Calip.’ He then repeated this a second and a third time. When someone bade him to stop repeating himself, Abu Huraira added ‘The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) dispatched an army of seven hundred under the command of Usamah bin Zaid. However, when they had just reached Dhi Khushub when Rasulullaah passed away and the Arab tribes around Madinah renounced Islam. It was then that the companions of Prophet of Allah (s.a.w) came to Abubakar and said, ‘O Abubakar! Recall the army. How can they be heading to Rome when the Arabs around Madina are renouncing Islam?!’

Abubakqar replied, ‘I swear by the being besides Whom there is none worthy of worship! EVEN THOUGH WILD DOGS SHOULD DRAG THE LEGS OF THE WIVES OF THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH (BECAUSE THERE IS NONE IN MADINAH TO DEFEND THEM), I SHALL NEVER RECALL AN ARMY THAT THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH had dispatched nor untie a flag that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) had tied.’ (Mukhtasar Ibn Asakir, volume 1, page 118, and Kanzul Ummaal volume 5, page 314)

“...The Messenger of Allah, directed Usamah Ibn Zaid, along with seven hundred men, to Syria. When they arrived at Dhu Khushub the Prophet, died, the Arabs around Madina reneged on their Islam and the companions of the Messenger of Allah, gathered around him and said, ‘Bring these back. Do you direct these against the Byzantines while the Arabs around Madina have

reneged?’ He said, ‘By the One Whom there is no god but Him, even IF DOGS WERE DRAGGING THE WIVES OF THE PROPHET, BY THEIR FEET I WOULD NOT RETURN AN ARMY WHICH THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH HAD SENT OUT, nor undo a standard which he had tied!’ He sent Usamah, and every tribe he would pass by which was wishing to renege would say (to themselves), ‘If these (the people of Madinah) did not have power, the like of these (the army) would not have come out from among, so let us leave them alone until they meet the Byzantines.’ They met them, defeated them, killed them and returned safely, so that they (the tribes) remained firm in Islam.” (The History of the Khalifahs who took the right way (“al-Khulafa’ ar-Rashidun – Tarikh al-Khulafa of Jalal ad-Din as-Suyuti”).

Aisha reported that: “After Prophet (s.a.w) passed away, all the Arab tribes renounced Islam and hypocrisy reared its ugly head. By Allah! Such conditions faced my father (Abubakar) that would crush a mighty mountain. THE SAHABAH (COMPANIONS) OF THE PROPHET APPEARED TO BE WET SHEEP ON A RAINY NIGHT IN A FOREST INFESTED WITH WILD ANIMALS. By Allah! Whenever the companions disputed any matter, my father would eliminate its harm, take control of the reins and pass decisive judgement.” (Narrated by Tabrani, reliable sources confirmed by Haithami volume 9, page 50). <https://discover-the-truth.com/2016/10/17/hadith-without-context-is-meaningless-abu-bakrs-apostasy-wars/> ET

[223] In the Shia book Nahjul Balagha a speech delivered by Ali where Ali says: “In the beginning of our matter, the people of Sham and us met. It is obvious that our God is one, our Prophet is one, and our call in Islam is one. We do not see ourselves more in faith in Allah or more in believing His messenger than them, nor they do. Our matter is one, except for our disagreement in Uthman’s blood, and we are innocent from his murder.” [Nahjul Balagha, letter 58]. And it comes in the Shia book “Nahjul Balagah,” sermon number 172, that Ali stated: “... The door of war has been opened between you and the other Muslims. And this banner will be borne only by him who is a man of sight, of endurance and of knowledge of the position of rightfulness...” ET

[224] Rustam the Commander-in-Chief of the Persian forces sent a message to the Muslim Commander Saad asking him to send an emissary for talks. Saad deputed Rabi bin Amir as the envoy. Rustam asked Rabi as to what was their mission. When Rustam, the king of Persia asked the Muslims, why had they come to Persia?

Rabiah Ibn 'Amir said “Allah the Most High has sent us to deliver you from worshipping the creation to worshipping the Creator of the creation and to deliver you from the constriction of this world to the vastness of this world and the

after life and from the oppression of the religions to the justice of Islam. Allah the Most High has sent us to save you from worshipping each other." Rabi said that their mission was to spread Islam. He said, "If you accept Islam we are brothers and there is peace between us; if you refuse we fight you and leave things to God." "What do you expect in return", asked Rustam. Rabi said, "Victory if we survive, and Paradise if we die fighting in the way of Allah".

The next day Rustam asked again for an emissary. This time Saad deputed Hudhaifa bin Mihsan. He rode over the carpet to Rustam's throne, and remained seated on his horse throughout the talks. "What do you expect of us", asked Rustam. Hudhaifa said, "We would expect you to become Muslims or pay Jizya." Rustam said, "What if we do not agree to both these alternatives."

Hudhaifa said that in that case the arbitration would rest with the sword. Saying that Hudhaifa rode back from the Persian camp.

For the third time Rustam asked for another envoy. This time Mughira bin Zurara was chosen as the Muslim emissary. Rustam said that it was perhaps their hardship that had I brought the Arabs to Iraq. He said: "It shall give your commander a set of clothes, a mule and 1,000 dirhams, and to every man among you two garments and a bag of dates. And you shall go away from us for I have no desire to kill you or take you in captivity." Mugheera said that times had changed, and because of Islam the Arabs were no longer fighting because they were poor or were subject to any hardship. They were fighting in the way of Allah, and they did not stand in need of any gifts from the Persians. Rustam thereupon said, "This means that there can be no peace between us. When we go to the battle, we will slay the whole lot of you." Thereupon Mugheera walked away from the Persian camp." Therefore, those who fought after the Prophet (s.a.w) under the two conditions: Fighting or surrender does so under the leadership of Abubakar, then Umar and then Uthman and later on Mu'awiyah bin Abu Sufyan, the first King in Islam after the Caliphate of Prophethood. <https://www.ummah.com/forum/forum/islam/general-islamic-topics/322882-rabi-ibn-amr-and-the-persian-king-rustum> ET

[225] Aisha gave her reason why she do not want her father to lead people in prayer thus: Narrated Aisha: (the wife of the Prophet) "When the ailment of Allah's Apostle became aggravated, he requested his wives to permit him to be (treated) nursed in my house, and they gave him permission. He came out (to my house), walking between two men with his feet dragging on the ground, between 'Abbas bin 'Abdul--Muttalib and another man" 'Ubaidullah said, "I told 'Abdullah of what 'Aisha had said, 'Abdullah bin 'Abbas said to me, 'Do you know who is the other man whom 'Aisha did not name?' I said, 'No.' Ibn 'Abbas

said, 'It was 'Ali bin Abu Talib.' 'Aisha, the wife of the Prophet used to narrate saying, "When Allah's Apostle entered my house and his disease became aggravated, he said, "Pour on me the water of seven water skins, the mouths of which have not been untied, so that I may give advice to the people.'" So we let him sit in a big basin belonging to Hafsa, the wife of the Prophet and then started to pour water on him from these water skins till he started pointing to us with his hands intending to say, 'You have done your job.'" 'Aisha added, "Then he went out to the people and led them in prayer and preached to them." 'Aisha and 'Abdullah bin 'Abbas said, "When Allah's Apostle became ill seriously, he started covering his face with his woolen sheet, and when he felt short of breath, he removed it from his face and said, 'That is so! Allah's (curse be on the Jews and the Christians, as they took the graves of their prophets as (places of worship),' intending to warn (the Muslims) of what they had done.'" 'Aisha added, "I argued with Allah's Apostle repeatedly about that matter (i.e. his order that Abu Bakr should lead the people in prayer in his place when he was ill), and what made me argue so much, was, that it never occurred to my mind that after the Prophet, the people would ever love a man who had taken his place, and I felt that anybody standing in his place, would be a bad omen to the people, so I wanted Allah's Apostle to give up the idea of choosing Abubakar (to lead the people in prayer)" (Bukhari). ET

[\[226\]](#) This epilogue was added by the translator.